Systematic Theology

A Complete Body of

Wesleyan Arminian Divinity

consisting of

Lectures on the Twenty-five Articles of Religion

by the late

Rev. Thos. O. Summers, D.D., LL.D.,

Professor of Systematic Theology in Vanderbilt University.

The Whole Arranged and Revised, With

Introduction, Copious Notes, Explanatory and Supplemental,

And a Theological Glossary,

by the

Rev. Jno. J. Tigert, M.A., S.T.B.,

Professor in Vanderbilt University.

In two volumes.

Vol. II.

Second Thousand.

Nashville, Tenn.:

Publishing House of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South.

J. D. Barbee, Agent.

1888.

Contents

Cover
Table of Contents
Copyright and C-i-P data
EPUB Adapter's notes
Systematic Theology.

Book VI. Anthropology: the Doctrine of Man.

Part I. Of Original or Birth Sin. (Art. VII.).

Chapter I. Pelagianism, Augustinianism, Arminianism.

I. Rise and Development of Pelagianism.

§ 1. Errors Attributed to Pelagius.
§ 2. Pelagianism before Pelagius.
§ 3. More Orthodox Patristic Views.
§ 4. Infant Baptism.

II. Rise and Development of Augustinianism.

§ 1. The Doctrine of Augustin.
§ 2. The Doctrine among the Scholastics.
§ 3. The Council of Trent.
§ 4. The Lutheran View.
§ 5. John Calvin.
§ 6. Reactions from Calvinism.

III. Via Media of Arminianism

§ 1. Statement of the Arminian View.
§ 2. Points of Difference.

§ 3. Methodism Rejects the Semi-Pelagianism of Limborch and Others.
§ 4. Methodist Doctrine of Universal Vicarious Satisfaction for Original Sin.

Chapter II. The Arminian Doctrine: Defense and Proof.

§ 1. The Phrase “Original Sin” Explained and Defended.
§ 2. Imputation Mediate, not Immediate.
§ 3. Negative and Positive Definition of Original Sin.
§ 4. Original Righteousness.
§ 5. The Image of God.
§ 6. The Nature of Virtue and Sin.
§ 7. No Semi-Pelagianism in the Article.
§ 8. Proofs of the Doctrine from Personal Experience.
§ 9. Proofs from Observation.
§ 10. Scriptural Proofs.
§ 11. Conclusion.

Part II. Of Free-will (Art. VIII).

Chapter I. Free-will and Inability.

§ 1. Pelagianism, Semi-Pelagianism, and their Modifications Condemned.
§ 2. “New Divinity” in New England: Parable of the Great Supper.
§ 3. What Is Meant by Free-will?
§ 4. Inability of Man.

Chapter II. Preventing and Co-operating Grace.

§ 1. Grace Defined.

§ 2. “Free Grace:” In All and For All.
§ 3. Regeneration Defined.
§ 4. Preventing Grace.
§ 5. Co-operating Grace.
§ 6. Synergism.

Chapter III. Scripture Proofs of the Doctrine.

§ 1. Preliminary.
§ 2. Moses and the Prophets.
§ 3. John vi. 44–46, and Parallel Passages.
§ 4. New Testament Examples.
§ 5. Synergism Taught in the Scriptures.

Part III. Of the Justification of Man. (Art. IX.).

Chapter I. Errors Concerning This Doctrine Stated and Refuted.

§ 1. Lutheran Views of the Doctrine.
§ 2. Patristic Statements.
§ 3. Baptismal Justification.
§ 4. Views of the Schoolmen.
§ 5. The Council of Trent.
§ 6. Bellarmin’s Development of the Tridentine Theory.
§ 7. Merit Excluded.
§ 8. Justifying Faith.
§ 9. Reconciliation of James with Paul.
§ 10. Mr. Wesley and the Conference of 1770.
§ 11. The Conference of 1771.
§ 12. Universality.
§ 13. Terminism.
§ 14. Apostates Answerable for All Their Sins.
§ 15. Conclusion.

Chapter II. Catholic and Evangelical Character of This Doctrine.

§ 1. Priestly Pardons.
§ 2. The Creed and the Lord's Prayer.
§ 3. Pardon by Prerogative Considered.
§ 4. The Calvinistic and Arminian Ordo Salutis.
§ 5. Dr. Cocker's Erroneous View of Justification.
§ 6. John Goodwin on Justification.
§ 7. John Calvin on Justification.
§ 8. John Wesley on Justification.
§ 9. Objections Answered.
§ 10. Conclusion.

Part IV. Of Good Works. (Art. X.).

Chapter I. The Works Designated Good.

§ 1. Good Works before Justification.
§ 2. Mr. Wesley on Good Works in General.
§ 3. Such Good Works Not Splendid Sins.
§ 4. Bishop Browne on the Thirteenth English Article.
§ 5. Definition of Good Works.
§ 6. Scriptural Examples Considered.

Chapter II. Relation of Good Works to Sin and Divine Judgment.

§ 1. Good Works Cannot Put Away Sin.
§ 2. Good Works Cannot Endure the Divine Scrutiny.

Chapter III. Positive Characteristics of Good Works.

I. Good Works Acceptable to God.

§ 1. Good Works Divinely Prescribed.
§ 2. Good Works Performed by Divine Grace.
§ 3. Good Works Redound to the Divine Glory.

II. Good Works the Fruit of Faith.

§ 1. Contrast of Living and Dead Faith.
§ 2. Our Lord's Test.
§ 3. Dr. Pope on "Living Faith."

Part V. Of Works of Supererogation (Art. XI.).

Chapter I. The Roman Doctrine Stated.

§ 1. Supererogation Defined.
§ 2. A Protestant Article.
§ 3. Sources of the Error.
§ 4. Romish Doctrine of Satisfaction.
§ 5. Evangelical Counsels.
§ 6. Jeremy Taylor on Luke xvii. 10.
§ 7. Exposition of Luke xvii. 10.
§ 8. The Two Great Commandments.
§ 9. No Distinction of Internal and External.
§ 10. Works of Supererogation Impossible.

Chapter II. Alleged Scriptural Examples Considered.

§ 1. The Rich Ruler and Voluntary Poverty.
§ 2. Christian Communism.
§ 3. Celibacy.

§ 4. Paul and Ministerial Compensation.
§ 5. Degrees in Excellency.
§ 6. Möhler's Doctrine Reviewed.

Part VI. Of Sin After Justification (Art. XII.).

Chapter I. Mr. Wesley's Changes Explained and Justified.

§ 1. The Substitution of Justification for Baptism.
§ 2. The Romish Distinction Between Mortal and Venial Sins.
§3. The Sin Against the Holy Ghost.

Chapter II. Novatianism.

§ 1. Historical.
§ 2. Critical Examination of Heb. vi. 4–6.
§ 3. Critical Examination of Heb. x. 26–31.
§ 4. The Ante-Nicene Church.
§ 5. Testimony of Scripture.
§ 6. Ancient and Modern Tendencies toward Novatianism.

Chapter III. The Dogma of Inamissible Grace Refuted.

§ 1. Historical.
§ 2. The Thesis to be Defended.
§ 3. Amissibility Set Forth in Scripture Didactically.
§ 4. Amissibility Implied in Positive Divine Injunctions.
§ 5. Amissibility Implied in Exhortations to Perseverance.
§ 6. Amissibility Implied in the Expostulations Concerning Apostasy.
§ 7. Amissibility Implied in the Warnings Against Apostasy.
§ 8. Amissibility Implied in the Rewards Promised to Perseverance.
§ 9. Amissibility Implied in the Prayers for Perseverance.

§ 10. Amissibility Demonstrated by Scriptural Examples of Apostasy.
§ 11. Amissibility Inculcated in Parables of our Lord,
§ 12. Amissibility Shown by the Weakness of Arguments to the Contrary.
§ 13. Flavel's Four Grounds Considered.
§ 14. The Full Assurance of Hope.
§ 15. Short and Easy Settlement of the Controversy.

Book VII. Ecclesiology: the Doctrine of the Church, Its Sacraments and Ministry.

Part I. Of the Church (Art. XIII.).

Chapter I. The Church: Its Scriptural Idea.

§ 1. The Distinction of Visible and Invisible.
§ 2. Membership in the Visible and Invisible Churches.
§ 3. Salvation Without the Pale of the Church.
§ 4. Signification of the Term Church in the Scriptures.
§ 5. New Testament Uses Discriminated.
§ 6. Sense of the Term in the Article, Catechism, and Apostles' Creed.

Chapter II. The Church as Catholic and Visible.

§ 1. Confusion of the Protestant Confessions.
§ 2. Greek, Roman, and High-church Errors.
§ 3. The True View of the Church, Visible and Catholic.

Chapter III. The Notes of the Church.

§ 1. Notes Enumerated by the Reformers.
§ 2. Cardinal Bellarmin’s Notes.
§ 3. Catholicity.
§ 4. Antiquity.
§ 5. Duration.
§ 6. Amplitude.
§ 7. Episcopal Succession.
§ 8. Apostolical Agreement.
§ 9. Unity.
§ 10. Sanctity of Doctrine.
§ 11. Efficacy of Doctrine.
§ 12. Holiness of Life.
§ 13. Miracles.
§ 14. Prophecy.
§ 15. Admission of Adversaries.
§ 16. Unhappy End of Adversaries.
§ 17. Temporal Felicity.
§ 18. Conclusion.

Part II. Of Purgatory, Pardons, Image-worship, etc. (Art. XIV.).

Chapter I. The Romish Doctrine of Purgatory.

§ 1. The Doctrine as Defined by Councils and Theologians.
§ 2. Alleged Scriptural Proofs.
§ 3. Patristic Proofs.
§ 4. The Action of Councils.
§ 5. Miraculous Proofs.
§ 6. Rational Proofs.
§ 7. Conclusion.

Chapter II. The Doctrine of Pardons or Indulgences.

§ 1. Definition and History.
§ 2. Romish Proofs Considered.

Chapter III. Image and Relic Worship.

§ 1. Introductory.
§ 2. Romish Statements.
§ 3. Universality of the Practice.
§ 4. Origin and Development of This Practice.
§ 5. Arguments for the Practice Refuted.

Chapter IV. The Invocation of Saints.

§ 1. Introductory.
§ 2. The Roman Position.
§ 3. The Romish Distinction of Degrees or Kinds of Worship.
§ 4. Mediation of Redemption and of Intercession.
§ 5. The Saints More Compassionate Than Christ.
§ 6. Prayers of Earthly and of Heavenly Saints.
§ 7. Saints and Angels in the Presence of God.
§ 8. Romish Proofs from Scripture Considered.
§ 9. Patristic Authorities.
§ 10. The Action of Councils.

Part III. Of Speaking in the Congregation in such a Tongue as the People Understand (Art. XV.).

Chapter I. The Practice and Its Apology.

§ 1. The Religionists Guilty of this Practice.
§ 2. The Apology Offered for the Practice.

Chapter II. The Practice Condemned by Scripture and the Primitive Church.

§ 1. By Scripture.
§ 2. By the Primitive Church.
§ 3. Conclusion.

Part IV. Of the Sacraments (Art. XVI.).

Chapter I. The Sacraments in General.

§ 1. Mr. Wesley's Changes.
§ 2. The Definition of a Sacrament.
§ 3. The Word Sacrament.
§ 4. Historical.
§ 5. The First Paragraph Directed Against the Zuinglian View.

Chapter II. The Five Pseudo-Sacraments.

§ 1. The Two Sacraments Ordained of Christ.
§ 2. The Five Spurious Sacraments Repudiated.
§ 3. Historical.
§ 4. Romish Arguments for the Number Seven.
§ 5. Confirmation.
§ 6. Penance.
§ 7. Orders.
§ 8. Matrimony.
§ 9. Extreme Unction.

Chapter III. The Use And Abuse of Sacraments.

§ 1. The Abuse.
§ 2. The Rightful Use and Effect as Opposed to the Romish Opus Operatum.

Part V. Of Baptism (Art. XVII.).

Chapter I. Definition and Significance of Baptism.

§ 1. Definition.
§ 2. Judaic, Johannine, and Christian Baptism.
§ 3. The Apostolic Practice.
§ 4. Baptism a Sign of Christian Profession.
§ 5. Objections to This Teaching Considered.
§ 6. Baptism a Sign of Regeneration.
§ 7. Baptismal Regeneration Disproved and Repudiated.
§ 8. The Mode of Baptism.

Chapter II. Infant Baptism.

§ 1. Introductory.
§ 2. Scriptural Proofs of Infant Baptism.
§ 3. Testimony of Antiquity.
§ 4. Proof Afforded by the Pelagian Controversy.
§ 5. Protestant Use of Patristic Testimony.
§ 6. Infants Subjects of Redeeming Grace, Hence of Baptism.
§ 7. Infants Embraced in the Gospel Covenant.
§ 8. Unity of the Church Under all Dispensations.
§ 9. Baptism Substituted for Circumcision as Rite of Initiation.
§ 10. Infant Church-membership Recognized in the New Testament.
§ 11. Errors To Be Avoided.

§ 12. Bishop Marvin on Infant Baptism and Parental Responsibility.

Part VI. Of the Lord’s-supper (Art. XVIII.).

Chapter I. The Lord’s-Supper: Design, Subjects, Matter, Form, Efficacy.

§ 1. A Sign of Christian Love.
§ 2. A Sacrament of our Redemption.
§ 3. The Subjects of This Ordinance.
§ 4. The Matter of This Sacrament.
§ 5. The Form of This Sacrament.
§ 6. Efficacy of This Sacrament.

Chapter II. Transubstantiation.

§ 1. Addition in King Edward’s Article.
§ 2. The Tridentine Doctrine.
§ 3. Romish Proofs from Scripture Considered.
§ 4. Patristic Proofs.
§ 5. Further Roman Proofs.
§ 6. History of the Dogma.
§ 7. The Superstitions Engendered.
§ 8. Lutheran Consubstantiation.
§ 9. Calvin’s Theory of the Spiritual Presence.
§ 10. Elevation and Worship of the Elements.

Part VII. Of Both Kinds (Art. XIX.).

Chapter I. The Romish Doctrine as Defined by the Councils.

§ 1. Introductory.
§ 2. The Council of Constance.
§ 3. The Council of Trent.

Chapter II. The Romish Arguments Stated and Refuted.

§ 1. Romish Claim Concerning Christ's Institution.
§ 2. Romish Claim of Christ's Administration at Emmaus.
§ 3. Romish Claim Based on Passages in the Acts.
§ 4. Romish Use of i Cor. xi. 27 and John vi. 51.
§ 5. Thomas Aquinas's Doctrine of "Concomitance."
§ 6. Puerile Objections to the Use of Wine.
§ 7. Romish Attempts to Prove Apostolic Half-communion.
§ 8. The Hussite Wars.
§ 9. Is the Romish Sect a Church?

Part VIII. Of the One Oblation of Christ, Finished Upon the Cross (Art. XX.).

Chapter I. The Romish Doctrine of the Mass.

§ 1. Canons of the Council of Trent.
§ 2. The Roman Catechism.
§ 3. Romish Proof from i Cor. x. 21 Considered.
§ 4. Alleged Old Testament Proofs.
§ 5. The Sacrifice of Melchizedek.
§ 6. Proofs from Tradition.

Chapter II. The Protestant Position.

§ 1. The Doctrine as Argued in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

§ 2. The Lord’s-supper Benefits Only Those Present.
§ 3. Conclusion.

Part IX. Of the Marriage of Ministers (Art. XXI.).

Chapter I. The Romish Doctrine Stated and Refuted.

§ 1. The Tridentine Statement.
§ 2. Inconsistency of the Church of Rome.
§ 3. Marriage of Apostles and Evangelists.
§ 4. Paul’s Doctrine.
§ 5. Monuments in the Catacombs.
§ 6. Historical.

Chapter II. The Vow of Celibacy.

§ 1. Such Vows Find No Support in Scripture.
§ 2. Grounds of the Romish Policy.
§ 3. Jeremy Taylor on Clerical Marriage.

Part X. Of the Rites and Ceremonies of Churches (Art. XXII.).

Chapter I. Rites and Ceremonies Defined and Classified.

§ 1. Rites and Ceremonies Defined.
§ 2. Two Kinds of Ceremonies.

Chapter II. The Two Classes of Ceremonies.

§ 1. Ceremonies: Required and Expedient.
§ 2. Ceremonies Lawful.
§ 3. By What Authority Shall Ceremonies be Prescribed?
§ 4. Conclusion.

Book VIII. Christian Ethics; or, Moral Theology.

Part I. Of the Rulers of the United States of America (Art. XXIII.).

Chapter I. The Christian and the State.

§ 1. The Article Devoid of Party Significance.
§ 2. Doctrine of the Scriptures.

Chapter II. Political Ethics.

§ 1. Dr. Pope on Political Ethics.
§ 2. Dr. Hodge on Obedience to Civil Magistrates.

Part II. Of Christian Men’s Goods. (Art. XXIV.).

Chapter I. Communism.

§ 1. Historical.
§ 2. The Scriptural Doctrine.

Chapter II. Christian Almsgiving.

§ 1. Scripture Teachings.
§ 2. General Principles of Christian Conduct.
§ 3. No Christian Tithe Law.

Part III. Of a Christian Man’s Oath (Art. XXV.).

Chapter I. Definition and History.

§ 1. Definition.
§ 2. Historical.

Chapter II. The Lawfulness of Oaths.

§ 1. Scripture Teachings.
§ 2. Our Saviour’s Command.

Page list

17
18
19

60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100

181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222

223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262

263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302

343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
378
379
380
381
382
383

464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504

Guide

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1888,
BY THE BOOK AGENTS OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH, SOUTH,
in the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington.

[This adaptation © 2026 somercet, released under the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 license (CC BY-SA 4.0).]

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data:

Names:

I. Summers, Thomas Osmond, 1812–1882, author.
II. Tigert, John James III, 1856–1906, editor, writer of preface.

Title: Systematic Theology : a complete body of Wesleyan Arminian divinity consisting of lectures on the Twenty-five Articles of Religion, vol. ii. / Rev. Thos. O. Summers. 519 pages. Electronic.
Description: EPUB adaptation of a public domain book. | Original: Nashville, Tenn.: Publishing House of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, 1888.
Identifiers: EPUB UUID: f8197c17-94f4-4392-94ae-1d570bd77f02
Classification: LCC BX 5331 .S846 1888 v.2
Subjects: LCSH:

1. Theology, Doctrinal—Methodist authors.
2. Arminianism.

EPUB Adapter's notes

Again, I thank archive.org for the source for this adaptation, and this EPUB has since been uploaded there.

Volume II came with a glossary which I have not included as of yet. It is in smaller type than the book proper, and the optical character recognition is decidedly incomprehensible. Running newer OCR on the scans is probably the way forward here.

Fixes made to the original text include: the spelling of Württemberg; a quote was added at "in remembrance of me:", after the colon on p. 454; "them" was changed to "you," and a closing quote added, per the KJV, on p. 210; and a quote mark added to the Revelation "dyed with blood" quote on p. 378.

This file was validated as EPUB 3.3 by EPUBCheck v. 5.3.0.

—somercet

Systematic Theology.

Book VI.
Anthropology: the Doctrine of Man; in his Two States of Nature and of Grace.

I. Of Original or Birth Sin. (Article VII.)
II. Of Free Will. (Article VIII.)
III. Of the Justification of Man. (Article IX.)
IV. Of Good Works. (Article X.)
V. Of Works of Supererogation. (Article XI.)
VI. Of Sin After Justification. (Article XII.)

Part I.

Article VII.
Of Original or Birth Sin.[1]

17

Original Sin standeth not in the following of Adam (as the Pelagians do vainly talk), but it is the corruption of the nature of every man, that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam, whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and of his own nature inclined to evil, and that continually.

Introduction.

The sound judgment of John Wesley was strikingly displayed in thus abridging the Ninth Article of the Anglican Confession, which reads as follows:

Original sin standeth not in the following of *Adam* (as the *Pelagians* do vainly talk;) but it is the fault and corruption of the nature of every man, that naturally is engendered of the offspring of *Adam*; whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and is of his own nature inclined to evil, so that the flesh lusteth always contrary to the Spirit; and therefore in every person born into the world, it deserveth God's wrath and damnation. And this infection of nature doth remain, yea in them that are regenerated; whereby the lust of the flesh, called in Greek *φρόνημα σαρκὸς* (which some do expound the wisdom, some sensuality, some the affection, some the desire, of the flesh,) is not subject to the Law of God. And although there is no condemnation for them that believe and are baptized; yet the apostle doth confess, that concupiscence and lust hath of itself the nature of sin.[2]

18

As a minister of a National Church whose confession was gotten up on the principle of compromise and comprehension, Wesley, like other Arminians of the English Church, put his own construction upon this article, so as to make it quadrate with Arminian orthodoxy. We are very thankful that we are not called upon to do the like. When he abridged the Thirty-nine Articles for the Methodist Episcopal Church in America, he omitted altogether the ambiguous portion of this article. Like the Seventeenth, the Ninth

Article has, to say the least, a Calvinistic tinge. Our Seventh Article is purely Arminian and Scriptural. The Anglican Article was evidently derived from the Second Article of the Augsburg Confession, which was drawn up before the Calvinistic controversy began, and had in view the Pelagianism of the Council of Trent, which it opposes. The Augsburg Article bears this title, "De Peccato Originis," which is nearly the same as the Latin title of the Anglican Article, "De Originali Peccato." It reads thus:

Our Churches likewise teach that, since the fall of Adam, all men who are naturally engendered are born with a depraved nature [*cum peccato*], that is, without the fear of God or confidence toward him; but with sinful prospensities, and that this disease, or natural depravity, is sin, and still condemns and causes eternal death to those who are not born again by baptism and the Holy Spirit. They condemn the Pelagians and others who deny that original corruption [*vitium originis*] is sin, and who, that they may diminish the glory of the merits and benefits of Christ, allege that man may, by the proper operation of reason, be justified before God.[3]

---

1. A few remarks concerning the general scope of this Book are here in place. Some theologians, as Dr. Knapp, giving the Doctrine concerning Man its largest place in the theological system, treat (1) of the state into which man is brought by the Fall, and (2) of the state into which man is brought by the Redemption. These in broad terms are the two great doctrines of Sin and Salvation (Hamartiology and Soteriology). The first is here represented by Articles VII. and VIII., "Of Original or Birth Sin," and "Of Free Will." and the second by the remaining Articles of this Book. The doctrines of Soteriology have already been in part anticipated in Book II., which treats of Christ and his Salvation (Soteriology *objective*), and in Book IV., which treats of the Holy Spirit and his Administration of Redemption (Soteriology *subjective*). But there is here only an apparent sacrifice of system, in Books II. and IV. the doctrine of salvation gathers about Christ and the Spirit, as the great Agents in its accomplishment: in Book VI. the same doctrine finds its center in man as the beneficiary and subject of the works of Christ and the Spirit.—T. ↩
2. This text of the Article, which Dr. Summers did not transcribe, has been inserted from the "Book of Common Prayer" of the Protestant Episcopal Church published by T. Nelson & Sons, New York, 1871, and certified by Bishop Horatio Potter, under date of April 3, 1856. —T. ↩

3. The full text of the Augsburg Confession, in both Latin and English, may be found in Appendix I. of Bishop Burnett's "Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles," from which source the above text is extracted. —T.↩

Chapter I.
Pelagianism, Augustinianism, Arminianism.

I. Rise and Development of Pelagianism.

§ 1. Errors Attributed to Pelagius.

19

The "others" alluded to [in the Augsburg Article] are the papists, who sanctioned some of the errors attributed to Pelagius. We say *attributed*, for it is somewhat difficult to ascertain his real sentiments. Hook, in his "Church Dictionary," gives the following account of Pelagius and his opinions:

Pelagius, being charged with heresy, left Home, and went into Africa, where he was present at the famous conference held at Carthage, between the Catholics and Donatists. From Carthage he traveled into Egypt, and at last went to Jerusalem, where he settled. He died somewhere in the East, but where is uncertain. His principal tenets, as we find them charged upon his disciple Coelestius by the church of Carthage, were these:

I. That Adam was by nature mortal, and, whether he had sinned or not, would have died,
II. That the consequences of Adam's sin were confined to his person, and the rest of mankind received no disadvantage thereby.
III. That the law qualified men for the kingdom of heaven, and was founded upon equal promises with the gospel.
IV. That, before the coming of our Saviour, some men lived without sin.
V. That newborn infants are in the same condition with Adam before his fall.
VI. That the general resurrection of the dead does not follow in virtue of our Saviour's resurrection.
VII. That a man may keep the commands of God without difficulty, and preserve himself in a perfect state of innocence.
VIII. That rich men cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven unless they part with all their estate.
IX. That the grace of God is not granted for the performance of every moral act; the liberty of the will, and information in points of duty, being sufficient for this purpose.
X. That the grace of God is given in proportion to our merits.
XI. That none can be called the sons of God, but those who are perfectly

free from sin.

XII. That our victory over temptation is not gained by God's assistance, but by the liberty of the will.

The great antagonist of Pelagius was Augustin, whose errors

20

on the one side were as great as those of Pelagius on the other; yet the one is canonized as a saint, and the other cursed as a heretic. The predestinarian scheme of Augustin is more derogatory to the divine glory and more shocking to our reason and sensibilities than that of Pelagius. But it does not follow from this that the errors attributed to the latter are not great, and that it does not behoove us to expose and denounce them. There is no necessity of embracing Augustianism in order to avoid Pelagianism. Arminianism steers clear of the Scylla of the one, and the Charybdis of the other. "That Adam was by nature mortal, and, whether he had sinned or not, would certainly have died," is plainly opposed to the Scriptures. Watson says pithily ("Institutes" ii. 18, p. 386):

> The Pelagian and Socinian notion, that Adam would have died had he not sinned, requires no other refutation than the words of the Apostle Paul, who declares expressly that death entered the world "by sin;" and so it inevitably follows, that, as to man, at least, but for sin there would have been no death. . . . The opinion of those divines who include in the penalty attached to the first offense the very "fullness of death," as it has been justly termed, death, bodily, spiritual, and eternal, is not to be puffed away by sarcasm, but stands firm on inspired testimony.

Indeed it does. God threatened Adam and Eve with death, in case of disobedience, and that that death included the separation of the soul from the body, commonly called temporal death, is clear from Gen. iii.—"Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." Hence they were driven out of Paradise, where alone grew the tree of life, which was the guarantee of their immortality. "In Adam all die," says the apostle. The Jews always so understood it. Thus we read in Wisdom ii. 23, 24: "For God created man to be immortal, and made him to be an image of his own eternity. Nevertheless, through envy of the devil came death into the world; and they that do hold of his side do find it."

Of course the kindred dogma attributed to Pelagius, "That the general resurrection of the dead does not follow in virtue of our Saviour's resurrection," is equally unscriptural, as the apostle says plainly, "For since by man came death, by man came also the

resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." (1 Cor. xv. 21, 22.) The second and fifth propositions attributed to Pelagius are specially opposed in this article.

§ 2. Pelagianism before Pelagius.

21

It has been affirmed that these propositions were held by the Fathers generally before Pelagius, while others deny this statement. The truth is that the primitive Fathers were not very precise or consistent in their dogmatic statements; hence they sometimes used language which sounds very much like Pelagianism, while they also use language such as we would use in regard to the consequences of Adam's sin. Hagenbach, speaking of the Fathers of the second and third centuries, says:

> Both death and physical evils were considered as the effects of Adam's sin; thus, *e. g.*, by Irenaeus and others. But opinions were not as yet fully developed concerning the moral depravity of each individual, and the sin of the race in general, considered as the effect of the first sin. They were so much disposed to look upon sin as the free act of man's will, that they could hardly conceive of it as simply an hereditary tendency, transmitted from one to another. The sin of every individual, as found in experience, had its type in the sin of Adam, and consequently appeared to be a repetition of the first sin rather than its necessary consequence. In order to explain the mysterious power which drives man to evil, they had recourse to the influence of the demons, strong, but not absolutely compulsory, rather than to a total bondage of the will as the result of original sin. Nevertheless, we meet in the writings of Irenaeus with intimations of more profound views about the effects of the fall. Tertullian and Origen aided more definitely the theory of original sin, though on different grounds. Origen thought that souls were stained with sin in a former state, and thus enter into the world in a sinful condition. To this idea he added another, allied to the notions of Gnostics and Manichees—viz., that there is a stain in physical generation itself. According to Tertullian, the soul itself is propagated with all its defects, as matter is propagated. The phrase *vitium originis*, first used by him, is in perfect accordance with this view. But both were far from considering inherent depravity as constituting accountability, and still farther from believing in the entire absence of human liberty.[1]

How nearly Justin Martyr approached Pelagius may be seen in

the following:

Though Justin Martyr uses strong expressions in lamenting the universal corruption of mankind, yet original sin, and the imputation of Adam's guilt, are conceptions foreign to him. At least man has still such right moral feelings that he judges and blames the sin of others as his. (Dial c. Try ph. c. 93, 95.) Compare what follows, according to which only those filled with the evil spirit, or wholly corrupted by bad education (and hence not the posterity of Adam as such) have lost this feeling. Accordingly every man deserves death, because in his disobedience he is like the first man.[2]

Clement of Alexandria thinks man stands in the same relation to the tempter in which Adam stood before the fall. He rejects

the opinion that original sin is imputed to children, and does not consider Psalm li. 5 as proof of this doctrine. Origen is called the precursor of Pelagius. He thinks that the death which came by sin (Rom. v.) is the separation of the soul from God; that the will is free; that concupiscence is not reckoned as sin, so long as it has not ripened into a purpose, guilt arising only when we yield to it; but that the human soul does not come into the world in a state of innocence, because it sinned in a former state; yet that man can be without sin, which Jerome calls *Origenis ramusculus*: the little branch of Origen, which developed into the tree of Pelagianism.

Tertullian [as we have seen] speaks of *vitium originis*, and says that evil has become man's second nature; though he does not seem to impute original sin to children as real sin, because he speaks of infants as innocent, when he pleads for the delay of their baptism; yet he would have them baptized to cleanse away original sin, if there was danger of their death! His disciple, Cyprian, defends the baptism of infants on the ground of their inherent depravity, but it was to cleanse them from a foreign guilt imputed to them, not from any guilt which is properly their own; he speaks of original sin as *contagio mortis antiquae*, in Ep. 59; but says that it does not annul freedom.

Speaking of the Greek Fathers of the succeeding period, Hagenbach says:

Even those theologians who kept themselves free from the influence of the Augustinian system, held that the sin of Adam was followed by disastrous effects upon the human race, but restricted these evils (as the Fathers of the preceding period had done) to the mortality of the body, the hardships and miseries of life, also admitting that the moral powers of man

had been enfeebled by the fall. Thus Gregory of Nazianzum in particular (to whom Augustin appealed in preference to all others) maintained that both the νοῦς and the ψυχή have been considerably impaired by sin and regarded the perversion of the religious consciousness seen in idolatry, which previous teachers had ascribed to the influence of demons, as an inevitable effect of the first sin. But he was far from asserting the total depravity of mankind, and the entire loss of free will. On the contrary, the doctrine of the freedom of the will continued to be distinctly maintained by the Greek Church. Athanasius himself, the father of orthodoxy, maintained in the strongest terms that man has the ability of choosing good as well as evil, and even allowed exceptions from original sin, alleging that several individuals, who lived prior to he appearance of Christ, were free from it. Cyril of Jerusalem also assumed that the life of man begins in a state of innocence, and that sin enters only with the use of free will. Similar views were entertained by Ephraem the Syrian, Gregory of Nyssa, Basil the Great, and others. Chrysostom, whose whole tendency was of a practical

and moral kind, insisted most of all upon the liberty of man and his moral self-determination, and passed a severe censure upon those who endeavored to excuse their own defects by ascribing the origin of sin to the fall of Adam.[3]

Gregory of Nyssa admits that there is a marvelous bias to sin, but he finds no sin in infants. Hagenbach continues:

During this period, as well as the preceding, the theologians of the Western Church were more favorable than those of the Eastern to the Augustinian doctrine. Even Arnobius speaks of a connatural infirmity, making men prone to sin. Hilary, and Ambrose of Milan, taught the defilement of sin by birth; Ambrose appealed especially to Psalm li. 5 in support of original sin, but without determining to what extent every individual shares in the common guilt. Nevertheless, neither of them excluded the liberty of man from the work of moral reformation. Even Augustin himself, at an earlier period of his life, defended human freedom in opposition to the Manicheans.[4]

§ 3. More Orthodox Patristic Views.

We have stated that though the early Fathers, as we have seen, used language that savors of Pelagianism, or Semi-Pelagianism, yet they also use language such as we would use in regard to the consequences of Adam's sin. Bishop Browne says:

That the early Fathers of the Christian Church held the universality of

human corruption, there can be but little question. A history of infant baptism is also a history of the doctrine of original sin, baptism being for the remission of sin. If there were no original sin, infants could have no need to be baptized. Hence Wall, in his "History of Infant Baptism," has brought together, with great labor and fidelity, passages from the earliest writers, showing their belief in the original infection of our nature from Adam. It is not to be expected that the Fathers speak as clearly on this point before, as after the rise of Pelagianism. But a fair inspection of the passages thus cited will convince us that the doctrine was held almost as clearly as is expressed in our own article, from the very earliest times of the Church. For examples of the language of the Fathers we may take the following passages: "Besides the evil," says Tertullian, "which the soul contracts from the intervention of the wicked spirit, there is an antecedent, and, in a certain sense, natural evil arising from its corrupt origin. For, as we have already observed, the corruption of our nature is another nature, having its proper god and father, namely, the author of that corruption." Cyprian, and the council of sixty-six bishops with him (A.D. 253), in their Epistle to Fidus, use the following words: "If then the greatest offenders, and they that have grievously sinned against God before, have, when they afterward come to believe, forgiveness of sins, and no person is kept off from baptism and this grace, how much less reason is there to refuse an infant, who, being newly born, has no sin save that, being descended from Adam according to the flesh, he has from this very birth contracted the contagion of the death anciently threatened; who comes for this reason more easily to receive forgiveness of sins, because they are not his own but others' sins that are forgiven him."

Bishop Browne, it will be seen, fully indorses the error of the Fathers in regard to the virtue of baptism. Alluding to Origen, he says:

> At times he speaks most clearly of all men being born in sin, and needing purification. For example, Augustin could not speak more plainly than the following in his homily on Leviticus viii. 3: *Quod si placet*, etc. "Hear David speaking, 'I was,' says he, 'conceived in iniquity, and in sin did my mother bring me forth,' showing that every soul that is born in the flesh is polluted with the filth of sin and iniquity; and that, therefore, that was said which we mentioned before, that none is clear from pollution though his life be but the length of one day. Besides all this, let it be considered what is the reason that whereas the baptism of the Church is given for the forgiveness of sin, infants also are, by the usage of the Church, baptized; when if there were nothing in infants that wanted forgiveness and mercy, the grace of baptism would be needless to them."

It seems the question was discussed in Origen's day as in ours,

for, in a homily on Luke, he says:

Having occasion given in this place, I will mention a thing that causes frequent inquiries among the brethren. Infants are baptized for the forgiveness of sins. Of what sins? or when have they sinned? or how can any reason of the law in their case hold good, but according to that sense we mentioned even now—none are free from pollution, though his life be but the length of one day upon the earth? And it is for that reason, because by the sacrament of baptism the pollution of our birth is taken away, that infants are baptized.

So in his Commentary on Romans:

For this also it was, that the Church had from the apostles a tradition (or order) to give baptism even to infants. For they to whom the divine mysteries were committed knew that there is in all persons the natural pollution of sin, which must be done away by water and the Spirit; by reason of which the body itself is called the body of sin.

§ 4. Infant Baptism.

It may be proper here to state that it does not follow that because a man baptizes children he therefore believes that they were born in sin, or that they are cleansed from original sin in and by baptism. Pelagius himself baptized infants, and says he never heard of any, orthodox or heretic, who did not; but he says they were baptized in order to the remission of future sins; but children who die without baptism, he thought, would be saved, though they would experience a less degree of felicity than those that were baptized. Augustin says, “A short time ago, when I was at Carthage, I heard the passing remark from some that infants are not baptized for the forgiveness of sins, but as an act of consecration to Christianity.” He may have

alluded to the Pelagians; as he elsewhere distinguishes them from some others who founded infant baptism upon actual sins committed by infants—which is worse than Luther’s vagary that infants can believe, and may therefore be baptized. Augustin says:

The Pelagians maintain that infants are so born without any shackles whatever of original sin, that there is nothing at all to be forgiven them through the second birth, but that they are baptized in order to admission into the kingdom of God, through regeneration to the filial state; and

therefore they are changed from good to better, but are not by that renovation freed from any evil at all of the old imputation. For they promise them, even if unbaptized, an eternal and blessed life, though out of the kingdom of God.

We must take what Augustin says of the Pelagians *cum grano*. But it is clear that Pelagius baptized children as an act of consecration to Christianity, as we do, though we recognize in this sacrament the inherent and inherited depravity of children which requires for its removal the sanctifying influences of the Holy Spirit symbolized in baptism, not accomplished by it, which is really what many of the Fathers may have meant by their rhetorical, ambiguous, and unguarded language on this subject.

II. Rise and Development of Augustinianism.

§ 1. The Doctrine of Augustin.

Augustin was the great antagonist of Pelagius and Pelagianism. Hagenbach says he was led

to conjecture a mysterious connection subsisting between the transgression of Adam and the sin of all men—a connection which loses itself in the dim beginnings of nature no less than of history. Mere suppositions, however, did not satisfy his mind; but, carrying out his system in all its logical consequences, and applying a false exegesis to certain passages, he laid down the following rigid proposition as his doctrine: "As all men have sinned in Adam, they are justly subject to the condemnation of God on account of this hereditary sin and the guilt thereof."[5]

By his remorseless logic, Augustin concluded that non-elect and unbaptized infants would be damned. His line of argument, says Hagenbach, is as follows:

Every man is born in sin, and stands therefore in need of pardon. He obtains this by baptism: it cleanses children from original sin, and those who are baptized in later years, not only from original sin, but also from their actual transgressions before the baptism. Since baptism is the only and necessary condition of salvation, it follows that unbaptized children are condemned (this fully accorded

with his views on predestination). He was nevertheless disposed to look upon this condemnation as *mitissima* and *tolerabilior*, though he opposed the

doctrine condemned by the Synod of Carthage, in Canon ii. (A.D. 419), of an intermediate state, in which unbaptized infants were said to be.[6]

Augustin disclaimed the phrases *peccatum naturae, peccatum naturale*, imputed to him by the Pelagians, always using the phrase, which he seems to have been the first to use, *peccatum originale*, whence our phrase, original sin. Augustin laid great stress upon Rom. v. 12; rendered in the Vulgate, which he used, *in quo omnes peccaverunt*, "in whom all have sinned," as in the margin of the Authorized Version, where the text is correct, "for that all have sinned." But it must not be supposed that his appalling system was built up exclusively on this exegetical error. Hagenbach traces it to other causes:

1. His own experience.
2. Perhaps some vestiges of his former Manichean notions, of which he himself might be unconscious, e. g., defilement in the act of generation: concupiscence, he says, is not attributed to the regenerate as sin, but, as far as nature is concerned, it is not without sin; hence every one conceived and born in the way of nature is under sin until he is born again through him, *quem sine ista concupiscentia virgo concepit.*
3. His realistic mode of thinking, which led him to confound the abstract with the concrete, and to consider the individual as a transient and vanishing part of the whole (*massa perditionis*).
4. His notions of the Church as a living organism, and of the effects of infant baptism.
5. The opposition which he was compelled to make to Pelagianism and its possible consequences, threatening to destroy all deeper views of the Christian system.

Thus, according to Augustin, not only was physical death a punishment inflicted upon Adam and all his posterity, but he looked upon original sin itself as being in some sense a punishment of the first transgression, though it was also a real sin (God punishes sin by sin), and can therefore be imputed to every individual. But it is on this very point, first strongly emphasized by him, viz., the imputation of original sin, that his views differed from all former opinions, however strict they were. He endeavored to clear himself from the charge of Manicheism (in opposition to Julian), by designating sin, not as a *substance*, but as a *vitium*, a languor; he even charged his opponents with Manicheism. So too he could very well distinguish between the sin, which is common to all men, and proper crime, from which the pious are preserved. (Sec. 111. Vol. I. 301.)

The doctrine thus formulated by Augustin obtained largely in the Western Church, but not in the Eastern. The Greek Church has

always been Libertarian and Synergistic, with a strong bias to Semi-Pelagianism.

§ 2. The Doctrine among the Scholastics.

The schoolmen discussed the subject of original sin in all its
27
bearings. They generally, however, maintained that man's body was infected by the fall, from the poison of the forbidden fruit, or some other cause; but the soul suffered only as deprived of that which man possessed in his primeval state, the presence of the Holy Spirit and supernatural righteousness, and as having the imputation of sin derived from Adam. The infection of the body is not sin, but a fuel which might be kindled into sin; the soul however contracted *guilt* from imputation of Adam's guilt, not *sin* from the inheritance of Adam's sin. Augustin doubted whether the soul, as well as the body, is derived from the parents, and so contracts sin from them; but the schoolmen were generally Creationists, and so denied the derivation of sin to the soul, which is infected by union with the body.

§ 3. The Council of Trent.

The Council of Trent reverted nearly to the Augustinian standpoint. The Council decreed

1. that Adam by transgression lost holiness and justice, incurred the wrath of God, death, thralldom to the devil, and was infected both in body and soul;
2. that Adam derived to his posterity death of body and sin of soul;
3. that sin transmitted by generation, not by imitation, can be abolished by no remedy but the death of Christ, and that his merit is applied to children in baptism, as well as to adults;
4. that newly born children ought to be baptized, as having contracted sin from Adam;
5. that by the grace of baptism the guilt of original sin is remitted, and all is removed which has the true and proper nature of sin; and though the concupiscence remaining is

called by the apostle sin, the Synod declared that it is not true and proper sin, but is so termed because it arises from sin and inclines to it.

The Fathers of Trent have the advantage of Augustin in this, that they do not embarrass the doctrine with the predestinarian views of that Father. They admit with him that unbaptized infants are damned because of Adam's sin, but they do not allow that any who are baptized are damned, whereas Augustin held that, baptized or not baptized, non-elect infants are damned. The Ninth Anglican Article condemns their notion that concupiscence is not properly sin.

§ 4. The Lutheran View.

The Lutherans hold that concupiscence has the nature of sin, and that the infection, though not the imputation of sin, remains

in the baptized and regenerate. The Augsburg Confession says it is truly sin and deserving of damnation unless we are born again by baptism and the Holy Spirit.

§ 5. John Calvin.

Calvin differs very little from Augustin, who was his great model. He describes this subject at great length in his "Institutes," Book II., Chap, i., 5–11. He says:

As the spiritual life of Adam consisted in a union to his Maker, so an alienation from him was the death of his soul. When the divine image in him was obliterated, and he was punished with the loss of wisdom, strength, sanctity, truth, and righteousness, with which he had been adorned, but which was succeeded by the dreadful pests of ignorance, impotence, impurity, vanity, and iniquity, he suffered not alone, but involved all his posterity with him, and plunged them into the same miseries. This is that hereditary corruption which the Fathers called *original sin*—meaning by sin, the depravation of a nature previously good and pure; on which subject they had much contention, nothing being more remote from natural reason than that all should be criminated on account of the guilt of one, and thus his sin become common; which seems to be the

reason why the most ancient doctors of the Church did but obscurely glance at this point, or at least explained it with less perspicuity than it required. Yet this timidity could not prevent Pelagius from arising, who profanely pretended that the sin of Adam only ruined himself, and did not injure his descendants. By concealing the disease with this delusion, Satan attempted to render it incurable. But when it was evinced by the plain testimony of the Scripture that sin was communicated from the first man to all his posterity, he sophistically urged that it was communicated by imitation, not by propagation. Therefore good men, and beyond all others Augustin, have labored to demonstrate that we are not corrupted by any adventitious means, but that we derive an innate depravity from our very birth.

He then cites Ps. li. 5; Job xiv. 4; Rom. v. 12., 19; 1 Cor. xv. 22; Eph. ii. 3; John iii. 5, 6, in support of this view. He proceeds:

Nor, to enable us to understand this subject, have we any need to enter on that tedious dispute with which the Fathers were not a little perplexed, whether the soul of a son proceeds by derivation or transmission from the soul of the father, because the soul is the principal seat of the pollution. We ought to be satisfied with this, that the Lord deposited with Adam the endowments he chose to confer on human nature, and therefore that when he lost the favors he had received he lost them not only for himself, but for us all. Who will be solicitous about a transmission of the soul when he hears that Adam received the ornaments that he lost no less for us than himself? that they were given not to one man only, but to the whole human nature? There is nothing absurd therefore if, in consequence of his being spoiled of his dignities, that nature be destitute and poor, if, in consequence of his being polluted with sin, the whole nature be infected with the contagion. From a putrefied root therefore have sprung putrid branches, which have transmitted

their putrescence to remote ramifications. For the children were so vitiated in their parent that they became contagions to their descendants: there was in Adam such a spring of corruption that it is transfused from parents to children in a perpetual stream. But the cause of the contagion is not in the substance of the body or of the soul, but because it was ordained by God that the gifts which he conferred on the first man should by him be preserved or lost both for himself and for all his posterity. But the cant of the Pelagians, that it is improbable that children should derive corruption from pious parents, whereas they ought rather to be sanctified by their purity, is easily refuted, for they descend from their carnal generation, not from their spiritual generation. Therefore, as Augustin says, “Neither the guilty unbeliever, nor the justified believer, generates innocent but guilty children, because the generation of both is from corrupted nature.” If they

in some measure participate of the sanctity of their parents, that is the peculiar benediction of the people of God, which supersedes not the first and universal curse previously denounced on the human nature: for their guilt is from nature, but their sanctification from supernatural grace.

On Calvin's basis it would seem that he ought not to have evaded the question concerning Creationism and Traducianism, but to have affirmed the latter, from which, however, his master Augustin shrunk. Calvin thus defines original sin:

An hereditary pravity and corruption of our nature diffused through all the parts of the soul, rendering us obnoxious to the divine wrath, and introducing in us those works which the Scripture calls "works of the flesh." And this is indeed what Paul frequently denominates sin. These two things therefore should be distinctly observed: First, that our nature being so totally vitiated and depraved, we are, on account of this very corruption, considered as convicted and justly condemned in the sight of God, to whom nothing is acceptable but righteousness, innocence, and purity. And this liableness to punishment arises not from the delinquency of another; for when it is said that the sin of Adam renders us obnoxious to the divine judgment, it is not to be understood as if we, though innocent, were undeservedly loaded with the guilt of his sin; but because we are all subject to a curse, in consequence of his transgression, he is therefore said to have involved us in guilt. Nevertheless, we derive from him, not only the punishment, but also the pollution to which the punishment is justly due. Wherefore Augustin, though he frequently calls it the sin of another, the more clearly to indicate its transmission to us by propagation, yet, at the same time, also asserts it properly to belong to every individual. And the apostle himself expressly declares that "death has therefore passed upon all men, for that all have sinned;" that is, have been involved in original sin and defiled with its blemishes. And therefore infants themselves, as they bring their condemnation into the world with them, are rendered obnoxious to punishment by their own sinfulness, not by the sinfulness of another. For though they have not yet produced the fruits of their iniquity, yet they have the seed of it within them, even their whole nature is, as it were, a seed of sin, and therefore cannot but be odious and abominable to God. Whence it follows that it is properly accounted sin in the sight of God, because there could be no guilt without crime. The other thing

to be remarked is that this depravity never ceases in us, but is perpetually producing new fruits, those works of the flesh which we have before described, like the emission of flame and sparks from a heated furnace, or like the streams of water from a never-failing spring. Wherefore those who have defined original sin as a privation of the original righteousness, which we ought to possess, though they comprise the whole of the subject, yet

have not used language sufficiently expressive of its operation and influence. For our nature is not only destitute of all good, but is so fertile in all evils that It cannot remain inactive, Those who have called it *concupiscence* have used an expression not improper, if it were only added, which is far from being conceded by most persons, that every thing in man, the understanding and will, the soul and body, is polluted and engrossed by this concupiscence; or, to express it more briefly, that man is of himself nothing else but concupiscence. . . . We say therefore that man is corrupted by a natural depravity, but which did not originate from nature. We deny that it proceeded from nature, to signify that it is rather an adventitious quality or accident, than a substantial property originally innate; yet we call it natural, that no one may suppose it to be contracted by every individual from corrupt habit, whereas it prevails over all by hereditary right. Nor is this representation of ours without authority; for the same reason the apostle says that we are all by nature the children of wrath. How could God, who is pleased with all his meanest works, be angry with the noblest of his creatures? But he is angry rather with the corruption of his work than with the work itself. Therefore if, on account of the corruption of human nature, man be justly said to be naturally abominable to God, he may also be truly said to be naturally depraved and corrupt; as Augustin, in consequence of the corruption of nature, hesitates not to call those sins natural which necessarily predominate in our flesh, where they are not prevented by the grace of God. Thus vanishes the foolish and nugatory system of the Manicheans, who, having imagined in man a substantial wickedness, presumed to invent for him a new creator, that they might not appear to assign the cause and origin of evil to a righteous God.

This theory of Calvin involves the damnation of infants, unless they are saved from the condemned mass of Adam's posterity by the decree of predestination, by which some are elected to be saved and others reprobated. This "horrible decree," as Calvin calls it, is set forth in his third book, where (chap. xxiii. 7), in a bitter reply to objectors, he says:

How came it to pass that the fall of Adam, independent of any remedy, should involve so many nations with their infant children in eternal death, but because such was the will of God? Their tongues, so loquacious on every other point, must here be struck dumb. It is a horrible decree (*decretum horribile*), I confess; but no one can deny that God foreknew the future final fate of man before he created him, and that he did foreknow it because it was appointed by his own decree.

We have thus at length presented Calvin's theory of original sin as a development, with a slight modification, of Augustin's,

and as the archetype of all the Calvinistic Confessions on this doctrine, and of the writings of leading Calvinistic divines, many of whom affirm, like Augustin and Calvin, that infants not only possess inherent and inherited depravity, but that if they are unbaptized, or non-elect, they are damned for it, though they die before they have lived a single day! Hence they are called "the hard fathers of infants." Were this the only explanation of original sin, it would be our bounden duty to renounce it with utter detestation and abhorrence.

§ 6. Reactions from Calvinism.

This execrable caricature of the doctrine had not a little to do in causing its rejection by many, shortly after the Reformation, and indeed to this day.

Thus the Socinians, in their abhorrence of Calvinism, swung over to Pelagianism, and their descendants, the Unitarians, adopt their views. So the Anabaptists. The Anglican Article in the first draught of it, in 1552, reads, "Original sin standeth not in the following of Adam, as the Pelagians do vainly talk, which also the Anabaptists do nowadays receive." Bishop Browne remarks, "Their rejection of infant baptism was of a piece, and naturally connected with their denial of original sin." That is quite likely, though, as we have seen, Pelagius baptized children notwithstanding his denial of original sin; while most of the Anabaptists of the present time—the General, Particular, Primitive, and some other sects of Baptists—indorse the Calvinistic theory of original sin, and yet repudiate infant baptism. Another division of them, however, the Campbellites (so-called), are largely tinctured with Pelagianism.[7]

III. Via Media of Arminianism

§ 1. Statement of the Arminian View.

Arminius steers clear of Pelagianism and Augustinianism, and gives the true scriptural account of original sin. In his seventh

Public Disputation "On the First Sin of the First Man," he says in Propositions xv., xvi, Works I. 485, 486:

The proper and immediate effect of this sin was the offending of the Deity. For since the form of sin is "the transgression of the law" (1 John iii. 4), it primarily and immediately [*impingit*] strikes against the Legislator himself (Gen. iii. 11), and this with the offending of one whose express will it was that his law [*non impingi*] should not be offended. From this violation of his law, God conceives just displeasure, which is the second effect of sin (iii. 16–19, 23, 24). But to anger succeeds infliction of punishment, which was in this instance twofold: (1) [*Reatus*] A liability to two deaths (ii. 17; Rom. vi. 23). (2) [*Privatio*] The withdrawing of the primitive righteousness and holiness, which, because they are the effects of the Holy Spirit dwelling in man, ought not to have remained in him after he had fallen from the favor of God, and had incurred the divine displeasure (Luke xix. 26). For this Spirit is a seal of God's favor and good-will (Rom. viii. 14, 15; 1 Cor. ii. 12). The whole of this sin, however, is not peculiar to our first parents, but is common to the entire race and to all their posterity, who, at the time when this sin was committed, were in their loins, and who have since descended from them by the natural mode of propagation, according to the primitive benediction. For in Adam "all have sinned" (Rom. v. 12). Wherefore, whatever punishment was brought down upon our first parents, has likewise pervaded and yet pursues all their posterity. So that all men "are by nature the children of wrath" (Eph. ii. 3), obnoxious to condemnation and to temporal as well as to eternal death; they are also devoid of that original righteousness and holiness (Rom. v. 12, 18, 19). With these evils they would remain oppressed forever unless they were liberated by Christ Jesus; to whom be glory forever.

In his Private Disputations he expands this view. Thus Dis. xxxi., Works II. 78, 79:

Because the condition of the covenant into which God entered with our first parents was this, that, if they continued in the favor and grace of God by an observance of this command and of others, the gifts conferred on them should be transmitted to their posterity, by the same divine grace which they had themselves received; but that if by disobedience they rendered themselves unworthy of those blessings, their posterity likewise [*carerent*] should not possess them, and should be [*obnoxii*] liable to the contrary evils. [*Hinc accidit ut*] This was the reason why all men who were to be propagated from them in a natural way became obnoxious to death temporal and eternal, and [*vacue*] devoid of this gift of the Holy Spirit or original righteousness. This punishment usually receives the appellation of "a privation of the image of God," and "original sin." But we permit this question to be made a subject of discussion: Must some contrary quality, besides [*carentiam*] the absence of original righteousness, be constituted as

another part of original sin? though we think it much more probable that this absence of original righteousness, only, is original sin itself, as being that which alone is sufficient to commit and produce any actual sin whatever. The discussion whether original sin be propagated by the soul or by the body, appears to us to be useless; and therefore the other, whether or not the soul be through traduction, seems also scarcely to be necessary to this matter.

33

In his eleventh Public Disputation he says (Works I. 526):

> In this state the free-will of man toward the true good is not only wounded, maimed, infirm, bent, and [*attenuatum*] weakened; but it is also [*captivatum*] imprisoned, destroyed, and lost, and its powers are not only debilitated and useless unless they be assisted by grace, but it has no powers whatever except such as are excited by divine grace. That this may be made more manifestly to appear, we will separately consider the mind, the affections or will, and [*potentiam*] the capability, as contradistinguished from them, as well as the life itself of an unregenerate man.

He then proceeds to show the depravity of the mind, affections, and powers, or, as we would express it, the intellect, sensibilities, and will, and also the life of the unregenerate, and closes with an explicit announcement of the doctrine of preventing, continuing, and following grace, as absolutely necessary to the performance of any good thing. Augustin (whom, by the way, in this particular, he quotes and indorses) could not more explicitly set forth the utter impotency of the natural man apart from divine grace.

§ 2. Points of Difference.

Wherein then, it may be asked, does he differ from Augustin and Calvin? In this, he holds that all who are lost in Adam are redeemed by Christ: “As by the offense of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life.” (Rom. v. 18.) Hence he censures the opinion of Augustin and others that infants unbaptized, or non-elect, are damned, though not with the punishment of feeling, but only with that of loss. He defends Borrius against the charges of his opponents, who condemned him for holding that all who die in infancy are saved, whether baptized or not, and that none of them are non-elect. If Adam and Eve were

allowed to propagate their species, though they would transmit to them their depravity, it would be under the merciful provisions of the covenant of grace, by which if they die in infancy they *must he saved*, and if they live to maturity they *may he saved*, and certainly *will he saved*, unless they neglect the great salvation. See his Apology, Articles xiii., xiv.: "Original sin will condemn no man," and "In every nation, all infants who die without [having committed] actual sins, are saved": articles ascribed to Borrius, Works I. 317–322. Thus the liability to eternal death of the

offspring of Adam supposes their rejection of the grace offered them in Christ.

It is observable that Arminius speaks of a twofold death as the result of the fall: temporal and eternal. We usually speak of a threefold death, but he considers spiritual death as the sin itself. But he also speaks of the fall as the separation of the soul from God, which we call spiritual death, so that there is really no difference between us.

What ignorance or impudence have those men who charge Arminius with Pelagianism, or any leaning thereto!

The Remonstrants—the followers of Arminius—emphatically re-affirmed his opinion, in "the Five Points" presented to the Synod of Dort, and warmly denounced the calumnies of their enemies, who ranked them with Pelagians and Semi-Pelagians. They say: "The will of man in a lapsed or fallen state, and before the call of God, has not the capability and liberty of willing any good that is of a saving nature," etc. They affirm that "God foresaw that Adam would willfully transgress the law, and thereby make *himself* and his *posterity* liable to condemnation, etc."

§ 3. Methodism Rejects the Semi-Pelagianism of Limborch and Others.

It is true Limborch and some other Remonstrants who came after, and also Jeremy Taylor, Whitby, and others, who pass under the name of Arminians, by a misnomer, leaned toward Semi-Pelagianism, in asserting that the consequences of the fall consist in a great liability to sin and in subjection to suffering and death, for the removal of which provision is made in the redemption by Christ. But it is a slander on Arminius and the Arminians to call that

Arminianism. All true Arminians, *e. g.*, the Methodists, firmly believe in the doctrine of original or birth sin, as set forth in the Seventh and Eighth Articles of our Confession. Here is what the standard Wesleyan Catechism says on the subject:

Q. Into what state did the fall bring mankind?

A. The fall brought mankind into a state of sin and misery. Rom. v. 12: "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned."

Q. Wherein consists the sinfulness of that state into which man fell?

A. It consists in the want of original righteousness, and the corruption of his

35

whole nature, which is commonly called original sin, together with all actual transgressions which proceed from it. Rom. v. 19: "By one man's disobedience many were made sinners." Rom. iii. 10: "There is none righteous, no not one." Ps. li. 5: "Behold I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me."

Q. In what consists the misery of that state into which man fell?

A. All mankind being born in sin, and following the devices and desires of their own corrupt hearts, are under the wrath and curse of God, and so are made liable to the miseries of this life, to death itself, and to the pains of hell hereafter. Eph. ii. 3: "And were by nature the children of wrath, even as others." Gal. iii. 10: "Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them." Rom. vi. 23: "The wages of sin is death."

§ 4. Methodist Doctrine of Universal Vicarious Satisfaction for Original Sin.

[Methodism, holding fast an evangelical Arminian theology, makes void the oft-repeated Calvinistic charge of "rationalism," "Pelagianism," etc., by giving an adequate interpretation of Rom. v. 12–21, and incorporating the teachings of this great scripture in its system. Paul declares: "Through one man sin entered into the world, and death through sin; and so death passed unto all men, for that all sinned." (Rom. v. 12.) Nothing is to be gained by attempting to break the force of the aorist in the clause, "for that all sinned." It has its usual force, referring to a momentary occurrence in past time, as opposed to the imperfect, denoting continuous action in the past. Of course the momentary occurrence was the sin and fall of Adam. John Wesley translates[8] and comments as follows: "*Even so*

death passed upon all men—namely, by one man, *in that*—so the word is used also, 2 Cor. v. 4: *all sinned*—in Adam. These words assign

the reason why death came upon *all men*; infants themselves not excepted, *in that all sinned.*"

It need hardly be said that no personal participation of Adam's posterity in his sin is meant. As Dr. Charles Hodge says ("Commentary on Romans," p. 236), "To say that a man acted thousands of years before his personality began does not rise even to the dignity of a contradiction; it has no meaning at all. It is a monstrous evil to make the Bible contradict the common sense and common consciousness of men." Dr. Hodge proceeds to advance his own view that all men "were regarded and treated as sinners on account of Adam's sin:" the ordinary Calvinistic doctrine of "immediate imputation," which offends as much against the moral intuitions as the idea of "personal participation" does against common sense. Dr. Shedd adopts the view of "personal participation," and against the doctrine of "immediate imputation" has this to say: "But it makes an infliction more inexplicable, rather than less so, to say that it is visited upon those who did not commit the sin that caused the death, but were fictitiously and gratuitously regarded as if they had." ("Commentary on Romans," p. 125.) "The reader may be referred to the Commentaries of these two writers [Drs. Hodge and Shedd] opposing each other," says President Dwight, of Yale (in Meyer's "Commentary on Romans," p. 223), "for a satisfactory refutation of the views of both."

Neither does Paul teach that the death of each of Adam's descendants is due to his own personal transgression. This is excluded by the statement and argument of verse 14: "Death reigned from Adam until Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the likeness of Adam's transgression." Upon this passage Mr. Wesley comments: "Even over infants who had never sinned, as Adam did, in their own persons; and over others, who had not, like him, sinned against an express law." So Meyer:

> If the death of men after Adam had been caused by their own sin, then in the case of all those who have died during the period from Adam to the law, the sin which they have committed must have been already reckoned to them as transgression of the law, just as Adam's sin was the transgression of the positive divine command, and as such brought upon

him death; but this is inconceivable, because the law was not in existence. In this Paul leaves out of consideration the Noachian commands (Gen. ix.), as well as other declarations of God as to his will given before the law, and likewise individual punitive judgments, such as in the case of Sodom, just because he has only the strict idea of real and formal legislation

before his mind, and this suggests to him simply the great epochs of the Paradisaic and Sinaitic legislations.[9]

Dr. Whedon wholly misapprehends the apostle on this point. He understands Paul to argue from the presence of death the presence of sin—which is correct—and, further, from the presence of sin the presence of law—which is incorrect. (See Whedon's Commentary *in loco*.) The Apostle seems to reason thus: Death reigned from Adam to Moses; therefore sin covers the same interval; but evidently, argues the Apostle, it is not the visitation of death on account of personal sin, committed after the likeness of Adam's transgression, for before the law, when there was no positive statute with annexed penalty, personal sin was not imputed in the exaction of the penalty of death; nevertheless, since death reigned from Adam to Moses, sin under some form was present, therefore—not law and penalty, as Dr. Whedon concludes—this universal death in the patriarchal age was because sin entered into the world, and, like death, passed unto all men, "by one man"—Adam. Compare Dr. A. Clarke on Rom. v. 13, 14.

The statement of verse 12, "for that all sinned," is, then, the same as that of verses 18 and 19, translated by Mr. Wesley, "Therefore by one offense the sentence of death came upon all men to condemnation," and "By the disobedience of one man many were constituted sinners." What are we to understand by these three parallel declarations? By a series of exclusions we have already greatly narrowed the field in which we must search for an answer.

1. "Personal participation" of Adam's posterity in his sin is out of the question—"does not rise even to the dignity of a contradiction."
2. An arbitrary and artificial transfer of responsibility for Adam's act to his unborn posterity ("immediate imputation"), however cloaked and dignified under the epithet of "judicial," is a pure fiction nowhere taught in the Bible, and is besides a moral monstrosity.

3. Death for personal transgression is excluded by the Apostle's own argument—verses 13, 14.
4. It remains that inherited depravity, "original sin," viewed as the uniform source of all evil, which Paul throughout his Epistles habitually designates as sin, is the ground of divine condemnation.

Meyer hesitates to recognize this sin which

entered into the world by Adam as "original sin" in the strict theological sense: the Apostle perhaps did not have in his mind an idea exactly coincident with the subsequently formulated dogma; yet Meyer regards this sin as "*the determination of the conduct in antagonism to God*, conceived, however, as a *force*, as a real power working and manifesting itself, exercising its dominion, in all cases of concrete sin. This moral mode of being in antagonism to God became existent in the human world through the fall of Adam, produced death, and spread death over all. Thus our verse itself describes the ἁμαρτία as a real objective *power*, and in so doing admits only of *this* explanation."[10] This doctrine, as Meyer says in another place (p. 208), "necessarily presupposes in respect to Adam's posterity the habitual want of *justitia originalis* and the possession of concupiscence."

Little exception can be taken to the following statements of Dr. Whedon:

> Adam, separated by sin from the Holy Spirit, was a naturally disposed sinner and, shut from the tree of life, a natural mortal; and so by the law of descent his posterity are naturally disposed sinners, and both naturally and penally mortal. . . . "All men sin"—such is their nature—when their probation presents itself. Such being their normal *action*, such must be their permanent *nature*. And infants are of the same nature, they needing only the possible conditions for actual sinning. The sentence of universal death must stand, therefore, because in the divine view men are by nature universal sinners.[11]

This universal sinfulness of human nature, therefore, is the ground of the divine displacency and the condemnation of death: so by the disobedience of one man many were constituted sinners.

Accepting then the teachings of this scripture, without seeking to avoid or abate its force, how has Methodism secured for the condemned race a standing-place before God? This is our final

inquiry. Methodism clearly perceives that to admit that mankind are actually born into the world justly under condemnation is to grant the foundation of the whole Calvinistic scheme. Granted natal desert of damnation, there can be no valid objection to the sovereign election of a few out of the reprobate mass, or to limited atonement, irresistible grace, and final perseverance to secure the present and eternal salvation of the sovereignly predestinated number—"to the praise of the glory of his grace."

As Watson pertinently says:

> It is an easy and plausible thing to say, in the usual loose and general manner of stating the sublapsarian doctrine, that the whole race having fallen in Adam, and become justly liable to eternal death, God might, without any impeachment of his justice, in the exercise of his sovereign grace, appoint some to life and salvation by Christ, and leave the others to their deserved punishment.[12]

Representative theologians of Methodism from the beginning until now, from Fletcher to Pope, have overthrown this fundamental teaching of Calvinism with the express statement of the Scriptures, setting over against the death-dealing first Adam the life-giving Second. If a decree of condemnation has been issued against original sin, irresponsibly derived from the first Adam, likewise a decree of justification has issued from the same court, whose benefits are unconditionally bestowed through the Second Adam. "Therefore, as by the offense of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous." (Rom. v. 18, 19.) The first member of each of these verses is fully balanced and reversed by the second member. Had not the intervention of the Second Adam been foreseen, universally making and constituting righteous all who were made and constituted sinners, Adam would never have been permitted to propagate his species, and the race would have been cut off in its sinning head.

Let us now hear the teachers of Methodism, and first the saintly Fletcher. In his "Third Check to Antinomianism" (Works, Vol. I., p. 161), he says:

> As we have considered three of the walls of your tower, it will not be amiss to cast a look upon the fourth; which is the utterly confounding of

the *four degrees* that make up a glorified saint's eternal justification:

1. That which passes upon all infants universally, and is thus described by St. Paul: "As by the offense of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men, unto *present* justification *from original sin and future* justification of life," upon their repenting and "believing in the light *during* the day of their visitation." In consequence of this degree of justification, we may, without impeaching the veracity of God, say to every creature, "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten son to reconcile them unto himself, not imputing to them" original sin unto eternal death, and blotting out their personal transgressions in the moment "they believe with the heart unto righteousness."

40

Fletcher then proceeds to his account of the other three "degrees" of justification, namely: Justification, or the pardon of actual sins, consequent upon believing; "justification consequent upon bringing forth the fruit of a lively faith"—the justification by works of St. James; and, finally, justification at the day of judgment. He concludes (p. 162):

All these degrees of justification are equally merited by Christ. We do nothing in order to be *first*, because it finds us in a state of total death. Toward the *second* we believe by the power freely given us in the first, and by the additional help of Christ's word and the Spirit's agency. We work by faith in order to the *third*. And we continue believing in Christ and working together with God, as we have opportunity, in order to the *fourth*.

The preaching distinctly these four degrees of a glorified saint's justification is attended with peculiar advantages. The *first* justification engages the sinner's attention, encourages his hope, and draws his heart by love. The *second* wounds the self-righteous Pharisee, who works without believing, while it binds up the heart of the returning publican, who has no plea but "God be merciful to me a sinner!" The *third* detects the hypocrisy and blasts the vain hopes of all Antinomians, who, instead of "showing their faith by their works, deny *in works* the Lord that bought them, and put him to an open shame." And while the fourth makes even a "Felix tremble," it causes believers to "pass the time of their sojourning here in humble fear" and cheerful watchfulness.

Though all these degrees of justification meet in glorified saints, we offer violence to Scripture if we think, with Dr. Crisp, that they are inseparable. For all the wicked who "quench the *convincing* Spirit," and are finally given up to a reprobate mind, fall from the fiRST, as well as Pharaoh. All who "receive the seed among thorns," all who "do not forgive their fellow-servants," all who "begin in the Spirit and end in the flesh," and all "who draw back," and become sons or daughters of "perdition," by

falling from the THIRD, lose the SECOND as Hymeneus, Philetus, and Demas. And none partake of the FOURTH but those who "bear fruit unto perfection," according to one or to another of the Divine dispensations; "some producing thirty-fold," like heathens, "some sixty-fold," like Jews, and "some a hundred-fold," like Christians.

From the whole it appears, that although we can absolutely do nothing toward our first justification, yet to say that neither faith nor works are required in order to the other three, is one of the boldest, most unscriptural, and most dangerous assertions in the world; which sets aside the best half of the Scriptures, and lets gross Antinomianism come in full tide upon the Church.

In the "Fourth Check to Antinomianism," Letter X. to Messrs. Richard and Rowland Hill (Works, Vol. I., pp. 283–285), Mr. Fletcher resumes the subject as follows:

In the Third Check (pp. 161 and 162), to make my readers sensible that Calvinism has confusion, and not Scripture, for its foundation, I made a scriptural distinction between the four degrees that constitute a saint's eternal justification, and each of these degrees I called a justification, because I thought I could speak

as the oracles of God, without exposing the truth of the gospel to the smiles of Christian wits.

I. From Rom. v. 18 I proved the justification of infants: "As by the offense of Adam (says the apostle) judgment came upon all men to condemnation, even so by the righteousness of Christ the free gift came upon all men to justification of life." In support of this justification, which comes upon all men in their infancy, I now advance the following arguments:

1. The Scripture tells us that "Christ in all things hath the pre-eminence." But if Adam is a more public person, a more general representative of mankind, than Jesus Christ, it is plain that in this grand respect Adam hath the pre-eminence over Christ. Now, as this cannot be, as Christ is at least equal to Adam, it follows that as Adam brought a general condemnation and a universal seed of death upon all infants, so Christ brings upon them a general justification, and a universal seed of life.

2. I never yet saw a Calvinist who denied that Christ died for Adam. Now, if the Redeemer died for our first parent, he undoubtedly expiated the original sin, the first transgression of Adam. And if Adam's original sin was atoned for and forgiven to him, as the Calvinists, I think, generally grant, does it not follow that although all infants are by nature children of wrath, yet through the redemption of Christ they are in a state of favor or justification? For how could God damn to all eternity any of Adam's children for a sin which Christ expiated—a sin which was forgiven almost

six thousand years ago to Adam, who committed it in person?

3. The force of this observation would strike our Calvinist brethren, if they consider that we were not less in Adam's loins when God gave his Son to Adam in the grand, original Gospel promise, than when Eve prevailed upon him to eat of the forbidden fruit. As all in him were included in the covenant of perfect obedience before the fall, so all in him were likewise interested in the covenant of grace and mercy after the fall. And we have full as much reason to believe that some of Adam's children never fell with him from a state of probation, according to the old covenant, as to suppose that some of them never rose with him to a state of probation, upon the terms of the new covenant, which stands upon better promises.

Thus, if we all received an unspeakable injury by being seminally in Adam when he fell, according to the first covenant, we all received also an unspeakable blessing by being in his loins when God spiritually raised him up, and placed him upon gospel ground. Nay, the blessing which we have in Christ is far superior to the curse which Adam entailed upon us: we stand our trial upon much more advantageous terms than Adam did in Paradise. For according to the first covenant, "judgment was by one offense to condemnation." One sin sunk the transgressor. But according to the free gift, or second covenant, provision is made in Christ for repenting of, and rising from "many offenses unto justification." (Rom. v. 16.)

4. Calvinists are now ashamed of consigning infants to the torments of hell; they begin to extend their election to them all. Even the translator of Zanchius believes that all children who die in their infancy are saved. Now, sir, if all children, or any of them, are saved, they are unconditionally justified according to our plan; for they cannot be "justified by faith," according to St. Paul's doctrine (Rom. v. 1), as it is granted that those who are not capable of understanding

are not capable of believing. Nor can they be "justified by works," according to St. James's doctrine, chap. ii. 24, for they are not accountable for their works who do not know good from evil nor their right hand from their left. Nor can they be justified by words, according to our Lord's doctrine (Matt. xii. 37), because they cannot yet form one articulate sound. It follows, then that all infants must be damned, or justified without faith, words, or works, according to our first distinction. But as you believe they are saved, the first degree of an adult saint's justification is not less founded upon your own sentiments than upon reason and scripture.

Dr. Wilbur Fisk, commenting on Rom. v. 18, says:

Guilt is not imputed until, by a voluntary rejection of the gospel, man makes the depravity of his nature the object of his own choice. Hence, although abstractly considered, this depravity is destructive to the possessors, yet through the grace of the gospel *all are born free from*

condemnation.

Dr. Whedon, though in a correspondence with the writer somewhat inclined to depreciate the doctrine here set forth, uses this language ("Commentary on Romans," p. 330):

> From Adam the continued race is, by the law of natural descent, born and constituted sinners. *Yet justification by Christ overlies the condemnation at birth*; and even when forfeited by sin may, by repentance and faith, be recovered and mature into holiness and eternal life.

In his comment on Eph. ii. 3, after a protracted discussion, Dr. Whedon concedes: "If, however, we must say that infants 'sinned in Adam,' let us be consistent, and add, 'but they also became justified in Christ.'" Certainly: that is the Apostle's teaching, and "beauty, truth, and reason are the outcome."

Dr. Miner Raymond, Professor of Systematic Theology in the Garrett Biblical Institute of the Methodist Episcopal Church, employs this language:

> The fact, as we see it, is that the race came into existence under grace. But for redemption the race had become extinct in the first pair, and the posterity of Adam would never have had personal, individual existence. Not only is existence secured for the posterity of Adam by the Second Adam, but also justification. From whatever of the displeasure or wrath of God, or condemnation that theoretically rested upon the race, because of corruption or guilt accruing from the first sin, they arc justified through Christ. (Rom. v. 18.) Not only does man come to conscious being, sustaining the relation of a justified, pardoned sinner, but as such he is entitled to and actually possesses all the requisites of a fair probation. Whatever influences and agencies of the Holy Spirit are necessary to qualify him for the exercise of free moral choices are graciously vouchsafed to him.[13]

In a valuable article in the "Wesley Memorial Volume," edited by Dr. J. O. A. Clarke, Dr. Pope gives a luminous, though

greatly condensed, epitome of Methodist doctrine. Our discussion of this subject may well include the following comprehensive presentation of Methodist teaching:

> The sin of Adam was expiated as representing the sin of the race as such, or of human nature, or of mankind: a realistic conception which was not borrowed from philosophic realism, and which no nominalism can ever really dislodge from the New Testament. "Christ gave himself as the Mediator of God and men, a ransom for all before any existed; and this

oblation before the foundation of the world was to be testified in due time, that individual sinners might know themselves to be members of a race vicariously saved as such." This free paraphrase of St. Paul's last testimony [in 1 Tim. ii. 4–6] does not overstrain its teaching, that the virtue of the great reconciliation abolished the sentence of death in all its meaning, as resting upon the posterity of Adam. In this sense it was absolutely vicarious; the transaction in the mind and purpose of the most Holy Trinity did not take our presence or concurrence, only our sin, into account. Therefore the Lamb slain before the foundation of the world was, as it respects the race of Adam, an absolutely vicarious sacrifice. The reconciliation of God to the world—the atonement proper—must be carried up to the awful sanctuary of the Divine Trinitarian essence. When the atonement is translated into time, set forth upon the cross, and administered by the Spirit, the simple and purely vicarious idea is modified. . . . With these modifications, as it respects the individual believer, does Methodism hold fast the doctrine of a universal vicarious satisfaction for the race. But marked prominence must be given to the consistency with which the universal benefit of the atonement has been carried out in its relation to original sin and the estate of the unregenerate world before God. Methodism not only holds that the condemnation of the original sin has been reversed; it also holds that the Holy Spirit, the source of all good, is given back to mankind in his preliminary influences as the Spirit of the coming Christ, the Desired of the nations.[14]

The foregoing doctrine is twice taught in the Articles of Religion as revised by Mr. Wesley. Article II. asserts that Christ is "a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for actual sins of men." And Article XX. teaches that Christ is a "satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual." In connection with this teaching of the Methodist Articles it must be kept in mind that Mr. Wesley deliberately omitted

from the Ninth English Article the words, "so that the flesh lusteth always contrary to the Spirit, and, therefore, in every person born into this world it deserves God's wrath and damnation," etc. If, then, Mr. Wesley, in formulating the Confession of American Methodism, expressly declined to assert that original sin "deserveth God's wrath and damnation" for every person at the time of his birth; and if he still embodied in this Methodist Creed the doctrine that Christ is a sacrifice for original sin and guilt: from these two premises the conclusion irresistibly follows that Mr. Wesley held, and intended the Confession of American Methodists to express, that Christ made a universal and unconditional atonement for

original sin. Mr. Wesley, in the last years of his life, in the full maturity of his knowledge, judgment, and experience, when engaged in the performance of the important task of giving a confession of faith to a new Church, as an Arminian theologian formulating the doctrine of an Arminian Church, denies that original sin "in every person born into the world deserveth God's wrath and damnation," and this because Christ is a sacrifice for original guilt. Thus is the dogma of Christ's unconditional vicarious satisfaction for original sin deeply set in the fabric of Methodist doctrine.]

---

1. "History of Doctrines," Vol. I., pp. 164–166.—T.↩
2. *Ibid.*↩
3. "History of Doctrines," Vol. I., pp. 293, 295.—T.↩
4. *Ibid.*↩
5. "History of Doctrines," Vol. I., p. 299.—T.↩
6. "History of Doctrines," Vol. I., p. 360.—T.↩
7. We called the attention of one of their preachers to a Pelagian passage in the *Gospel Advocate*, one of their periodicals, and asked him how many of their ministers believed it. He said he did not know, but supposed a good many of them, as he did himself. We told him it was Pelagian heresy, but he neither knew nor cared about that—he believed it!↩
8. In his preface to his "Explanatory Notes on the New Testament," from which the above quotation is taken, Mr. Wesley says: "In order to assist these in such a measure as I am able, I design first to set down the text itself, for the most part, in the common *English* translation, which is, in general (so far as I can judge), abundantly the best that I have seen. Yet I do not say it is incapable of being brought in several places nearer to the original. Neither will I affirm that the Greek copies from which this translation was made are always the most correct. And therefore I shall take the liberty, as occasion may require, to make here and there a small alteration." "Of the many points of interest connected with the translation of 1611," say the Revisers of 1881 in the New Testament preface, "two require special notice; first, the Greek text which it appears to have represented; and, secondly, the character of the translation itself." John Wesley's attitude toward such a revision is not difficult to infer. His changes in his New Testament "Notes" often practically coincide with those of the Revision.—T.↩
9. "Commentary on Romans," p. 204.↩

10. Meyer, “Commentary on Romans,” p. 195. Italics Meyer’s.↩
11. “Commentary on Romans,” pp. 327, 328.↩
12. “Institutes,” p. 580.↩
13. “Systematic Theology,” Vol. II., pp. 84, 85.↩
14. “Wesley Memorial Volume,” Art. “Methodist Doctrine,” by Dr. W. B. Pope, pp. 177, 178. With this compare Pope’s expanded treatment of the doctrine of Original Sin, “Compendium,” Vol. II., pp. 47–86; also his presentation of the “Finished Atonement” in the same volume, pp. 213–316. On p. 81 Pope quotes from Wesley a passage which I have not been able to find in his works, as follows: “That by the offense of one judgment came upon all men (all born into the world) to condemnation is an undoubted truth, and affects every infant, as well as every adult person. But it is equally true that by the righteousness of One the free gift came upon all men (all born into the world, infants and adults) unto justification.”—T.↩

Chapter II.
The Arminian Doctrine: Defense and Proof.

45

In the foregoing history of this article, and the errors to which it is opposed, we have expounded the doctrine which it propounds. It now remains to make a few additional explanations and to advance the proof of this important doctrine.

§ 1. The Phrase "Original Sin" Explained and Defended.

Exceptions have been taken to the phrase "original sin," as applied to this subject; but with no very good reason. Were we indeed called upon to name the evil in question, we should not perhaps call it with Tertullian, *vitium originis*, or with Augustin, *originale peccatum*, but rather *peccatum naturale*, using the word natural, as Tertullian says, *quodammodo*, in a certain manner, namely, to designate the evil that has become man's second nature; and not *proprie naturale*—properly natural—the first nature of man, that which he received from his Creator. This distinction meets the objection of those who cavil at the use of the phrase "natural depravity," "sin of our nature," or the like. The title of the article which furnishes a synonym for "Original," namely, "Birth Sin," shows that "Original Sin" does not mean the act of our first parents in eating the forbidden fruit: not the act itself, of course, for their posterity did not perform that act; nor the imputation of it, though in a certain sense that act is imputed to them. The human species is viewed as a solidarity, and it is represented by its head, commonly called its "federal head," because the covenant of life and death was made with him for himself and posterity. If he had not fallen, he would have propagated his species in innocence and happiness, and, continuing in that state, they would have been immortal, either on earth or in another sphere. But as he fell, his posterity would have perished in him, if the penalty threatened had been instantly enforced; but as a gracious reprieve was granted through the redemption of Christ, his posterity, though inheriting from him a depraved nature, share with him in all the blessings of the new

covenant administered by the Second Adam, who thus restores "the ruins of the first."

§ 2. Imputation Mediate, not Immediate.

This imputation is *mediate*, not *immediate*, as the schoolmen speak. *Immediate* imputation would make us personally responsible for Adam's sin, as if we had committed the act ourselves. This is impious and absurd. *Mediate* imputation implies a liability to death spiritual, temporal, and eternal, in consequence of Adam's sin, which would not have been personally realized by his posterity, who would have died seminally in him, if redemption had not been provided; but as that redemption has been provided for every man, though every man is liable to suffer all these consequences of the fall, yet they all may be reversed or overruled for good in the case of every man. The attainder of the treason of our forefathers is set aside in our case if we "receive the atonement;" and the temporal evils ending in the death of the body may be all overruled for our good, through this gracious economy. Thus, while Adam's sin makes guilty all his sons, none of them have any occasion to complain of the injustice of this imputation, because "where sin abounded, grace did much more abound: that as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord." (Rom. v. 20, 21.)

§ 3. Negative and Positive Definition of Original Sin.

The article however ignores the word *imputation*: perhaps because of its ambiguity. It defines "original sin," negatively and positively. Negatively, it does not consist in the following of Adam: *in imitatione Adami*. This we have seen, as the article says, is "as the Pelagians do vainly talk." Original or birth sin is predicated of infants who are incapable of committing actual sin. Positively, "it is the corruption of the nature of every man, that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam, whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and of his own nature inclined to evil, and that continually." In the Anglican Article it is "the fault and

corruption:" *vitium et depravatio*, the word *vitium* being borrowed from Tertullian. It seems to be used as a synonym of *depravatio*, "corruption," the latter word defining the former, and the former the latter, the more certainly to fix the sense. But our English word "fault" is generally used, in

a moral sense, to express our actual deviation from virtue, or something less than a crime, while corruption expresses the inward character; the latter word is sufficient, and the former may be spared. It is not to be understood of any essential change wrought in the substance of the soul, which is to us incomprehensible; nor of the positive infusion of evil into the soul; but it is the loss of original righteousness, and the incapacity for any good, and the liability to all evil which result from it. Arminius says, "We think that this absence alone of original righteousness is original sin itself;" but he well adds, "since it alone is sufficient for the commission and production of every actual sin whatever." This makes his statement agree with the more precise language of Watson:

> This is by some divines called, with great aptness, "a *depravation* arising from a *deprivation*," and is certainly much more consonant with the Scriptures than the opinion of the infusion of evil qualities into the nature of man by a positive cause or direct tainting of the heart. This has been, indeed, probably an opinion in the proper sense, with few, and has rather been collected from the strong and rhetorical expressions under which the moral state of man is often exhibited, and, on this account, has been attacked as a part of the doctrine of original sin, by the advocates of original innocence, and as making God directly the author of sin.

§ 4. Original Righteousness.

When it is said that by the fall we are "very far gone from original righteousness," it is important to ascertain what is meant by original righteousness.

Hagenbach, speaking of the time of the Reformation, says:

> During the present period, the opinion generally prevailed among Christians of all denominations that the state of our first parents was more excellent, both in respect to body and soul, prior to the fall than after it. But while theologians of the Roman Catholic Church agreed with the

majority of the scholastics in regarding the original righteousness of man as a *donum superadditum*, Protestants (Lutherans as well as Calvinists) maintained that God created man in the possession of perfect righteousness and holiness, qualities which, together with mortality, belonged to his original nature. Arminians and Socinians entertained less exalted opinions concerning the original state of man. The latter asserted that the image of God, after which man was created, has reference only to his dominion over animals, or the irrational creation in general, and denied that immortality belonged to the original endowments of human nature.[1]

He does injustice to Arminians by associating them with Socinians in this opinion. He says:

The Arminian symbols (Confess. Remonstrant. 5. 5, and Apol. Confess. p. 60,

48

quoted by Winer, p. 52) agree with Calvin in insisting on the original freedom of the will, but reject on this very account the notion of a primitive state of perfect holiness, because if there had been such, man could not have sinned. Thus Limborch, "Theolog. Christ.," ii. 24, 5, shows that that state of innocence of our first parents to which so much importance is attached must have been united with ignorance, otherwise they would have known that serpents cannot speak, and would have been led to suspect something wrong? Limborch admitted that man would not have died if he had not sinned, but he objected to the inference which orthodox theologians drew from it, viz., that immortality originally belonged to the nature of man—he thought that God would have protected him against death.[2]

Now it matters little what crude notions Limborch may have held; they are not Arminianism, any more than what Luther says fantastically is Lutheranism: "The eye of the first man surpassed the lynx and eagle in sharpness; his arm was stronger than the lion and the bear; he went among the strongest animals as if they were hounds." Indeed, Limborch is not far wrong if there was a literal serpent employed in the temptation. Eve certainly could not have been a very wise woman to let a snake deceive her, and Adam was not a Newton if he allowed himself to be a party in such a business. But Limborch was not a thorough Arminian. What the Remonstrants meant by rejecting the opinion that Adam was in a state of perfect holiness, differs but little from what Bishop Butler sets forth in the "Analogy," Part I., Chap, v., in regard to "virtuous habits" as a guard against error and vice. We quote a passage or two:

Mankind, and perhaps all finite creatures, from the very constitution of

their nature, before habits of virtue, are deficient, and in danger of deviating from what is right, and therefore stand in need of virtuous habits for a security against this danger.

Thus the principle of virtue, improved into a habit, of which improvement we are thus capable, will plainly be, in proportion to the strength of it, a security against the danger which finite creatures are in, from the very nature of propension or particular affections. . . . And thus it is plainly conceivable, that creatures without blemish as they come out of the hands of God may be in danger of going wrong, and so may stand in need of the security of virtuous habits, additional to the moral principle wrought into their natures by him. That which is the ground of their danger, or their want of security, may be considered as a deficiency in them, to which virtuous habits are the natural supply. And as they are naturally capable of being raised and improved by discipline, it may be a thing fit and requisite that they should be placed in circumstances with an eye to it—in circumstances peculiarly fitted to be, to them, a state of discipline for their improvement in virtue.

49

These views of this profound philosopher and divine, we believe, are generally indorsed: at all events few would be disposed to place them in contrast with orthodoxy.

The truth is, Arminianism is far more decided and consistent in regard to original righteousness than any of the Pelagian, patristic, scholastic, Romish, Lutheran, Calvinistic, Socinian, or other systems. It does not teach that Adam and Eve were babies or barbarians before the fall, but little wiser and better than after it; while, on the other hand, it does not make them gods (*Elohim*) equal or superior to angels in knowledge, holiness, and felicity. It does not make their virtue consist in a mere *donum superadditum*, a gift superadded to their nature, and not essential to it, as the Romanists speak, or mere "ornaments" with which man was originally decked, as others express it.

Watson ("Institutes," II., xviii., pp. 403, 404) says:

This privation is not fully expressed by the phrase, "the loss of original righteousness," unless that be meant to include in it the only source of righteousness in even the first man, the life which is imparted and supplied by the Holy Spirit. A similar want of explicitness we observe also in Calvin's own statement in his generally very able chapter on this subject, that Adam lost "the ornaments" he received from his Maker for us as well as for himself; unless we understand by these original "ornaments" and "endowments" of human nature in him, the *principle* also, as above stated, from which they all flowed; and which, being forfeited, could no longer be

imparted *in the way of nature.* For when the Spirit was restored to Adam, being pardoned, it was by grace and favor; and he could not impart it by natural descent to his posterity, though born of him when in a state of acceptance with God, since these influences are the gifts of God, which are imparted not by the first but by the second Adam: not by nature, but by a free gift to sinful and guilty man, the law being irreversible, "that which is born of the flesh is flesh." Arminius has more forcibly and explicitly expressed that privation of which we speak, by the forfeiture "of the gift of the Holy Spirit" by Adam, for himself and his descendants, and the loss of original righteousness as the consequence. This I take to be at once a simple and a scriptural view of the case.

It truly is; and Calvin says as much in his "Institutes" (II., i. 5. 10). [See the quotation from Calvin § 5, p. 28.]

§ 5. The Image of God.

Little exception, if any, is to be taken to Calvin's view of the image and likeness of God, in which man was created, and which was forfeited by the fall. (See Book I., xv. 3, 4). He censures Osiander's notion that the image of God extends promiscuously to the body as well as the soul, as the Word would have become

man if Adam had not fallen; and so Adam was formed after the image and likeness of Christ's humanity! He discards also the refinement of those who make "image" refer to the substance of the soul, and "likeness" to its qualities, since the words are synonymous, and both are used according to the Hebrew style of explicitness and emphasis, as "image," without the word "likeness," is afterward used to express the same idea. He also repudiates "that speculation of Augustin, that the soul is a mirror of the Trinity, because it contains understanding, will, and memory." He properly adds:

> Nor is there any probability in the opinion which places the similitude of God in the dominion committed to man; as though he resembled God only in this character, that he was constituted heir and possessor of all things, whereas it must be properly sought *in* him, not *without* him—it is an internal excellence of the soul.

That is true; nevertheless, man's dominion over the lower creation is a likeness of the divine sovereignty, and is the natural

and divinely appointed consequence of that "internal excellence of the soul" in which the image of God properly consists. Hence the association of the one with the other. (*Cf.* Gen. i. 26–28; ix. 1–6).

We would not altogether reject the speculation of Calvin (Book I., xv. 3):

> For though the glory of God is displayed in man's external form, yet there is no doubt that the proper seat of his image is in the soul. I admit that external form, as it distinguishes us from brutes, also exalts us more nearly to God; nor will I too vehemently contend with any one who would understand by the image of God that
>
> While the mute creation downward bend
> Their sight, and to their earthly mother tend,
> Man looks aloft, and with created eyes
> Beholds his own hereditary skies.—Ovid, *Met.* i.
>
> only let it be decided that the image of God which appears, or sparkles in these external characters, is spiritual.

Further than this we dare not go, lest we broach anthropomorphism.

What then is the image of God? It is twofold, (1) natural and (2) moral.

1. The natural image of God consists in *spirituality* in which inhere intellect, sensibility, and will; hence God is called "the Father of spirits" (Heb. xii. 9); and the apostle says as such we, his "offspring," ought not to think he can be represented by statues and the like. The only image of God is spiritual: Christ

in the highest sense—"who is the image of the invisible God"—and we in a subordinate sense; but incalculably above what may be called immateriality in the lower creatures. (Col. i. 15; Heb. i. 3; ii. 6–9; Ps. viii. 4, 8; Acts xvii. 28, 29.)

The natural image of God consists also in *immortality*. Thus Wisdom ii. 23, 24: "For God created man to be immortal, and made him to be an image of his own eternity. Nevertheless, through envy of the devil came death into the world; and they that do hold of his side do find it." This, of course, has no reference to the death of plants and animals; nor do the Scriptures say any thing, or philosophy any thing of consequence, concerning natural immortality as resulting from an immaterial, uncompounded substance; for though Adam possessed a spiritual, immaterial nature, yet he possessed also a physical, material nature, which, for

all that we can see, would have been subject to the same law of death as that under which plants and animals were placed, but for the supernatural endowment of immortality. That this is a part of the natural image of God, might be inferred from the law concerning murder: “Whoso sheddeth man’s blood, by man shall his blood be shed; for in the image of God made he man.” (Gen. ix. 6.) Death despoils that image.

2. But the natural image of God, in this discussion, is only to be considered as the basis of the moral image: the former is that in which the latter inheres, as we say the natural perfections of God are those in which his moral perfections inhere. But for his spiritual and immortal nature, man would be incapable of possessing and developing those qualities which constitute the moral image of God. These qualities are set forth explicitly by the apostle: “Lie not one to another, seeing that ye have put off the old man with his deeds, and have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him.” (Col. iii. 9, 10.) He then proceeds to exhort them therefore to put on all moral virtues, “and above all charity,” or love, “which is the bond of perfectness.” So more explicitly in Eph. iv. 22–24: “Put off the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts; and be renewed in the spirit of your mind; and that ye put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness.” This agrees precisely with Eccl. vii. 29: “God hath made man upright; but they have sought out many inventions.” Edwards

says “*jashur*, upright, is used at least eighty times in the sense of true virtue; it is thus constantly used in Solomon’s writings, and it is beyond all controversy that he uses it in this place to signify moral rectitude, or a character of real virtue and integrity. For the wise man is speaking of persons with respect to their moral character, inquiring into the corruption and depravity of mankind, and he here declares he had not found one among a thousand of the right stamp, truly and thoroughly virtuous and upright—which appeared a strange thing! But in this text he clears God, and lays the blame on man—man was not made thus at first. He was made of the right stamp, altogether good in his kind, truly and thoroughly virtuous, as he ought to be; ‘but they have sought out many inventions,’ which last expression signifies things sinful, or morally evil.”

When it is said that man was created in the image of God in

regard to knowledge, it does not mean simply the capacity of acquiring information: this belongs essentially to a spiritual nature, as we have seen. The mind of Adam was not a *tabula rasa*, a blank parchment on which things might be written. Adam was not a big baby, nor a savage. His mind was well stored with "the knowledge fit for man to know." He had ideas, and language to express them. But it does not follow from this that he was like the *Elohim*, either God or angels, "to know good and evil;" he was not omniscient nor infallible. Angels do not know every thing: they desire to look into the mysteries of redemption, and it is nowhere said that they make no mistakes in their speculations. They are finite creatures, and so were our first parents. Adam's knowledge was not encyclopedic, nor was it all intuitional. He was endowed with a sufficient capital, if we may so speak, to give him a start in the world; and as he was to "dress the garden and keep it," so he was to cultivate his own powers, develop them by study and application, and thus indefinitely increase his stock of knowledge. Eternal progression is the law of all finite intelligences, either unfallen or redeemed, as infinite possession is the exclusive and incommunicable property of the infinite Jehovah. We suppose that when they were created there were trees in Paradise of a large size, the circles of which, if they had any, would indicate the growth of a hundred years, and yet they were but just created, with roots, and heart, and sap, and bark, and boughs and leaves.

and flowers, and fruit. These were their original endowments by "special creation," but their after-growth and development was by the ordinary processes of nature and cultivation, involving soil, and air, and heat, and moisture, and horticultural attention. So with man: *he* was "a special creation," and as such had peculiar endowments—in one sense, natural; in another sense, supernatural; but his subsequent development depended upon the use which he made of his faculties and endowments, and the means and facilities of improvement which were placed within his reach.

So of "righteousness and true holiness." His heart was the temple of the Holy Ghost, who is the source of all the moral excellence there is in the universe. There was in man no principle of evil, no bias toward evil; but the contrary—a principle of goodness, a bias toward goodness. The Holy Spirit presiding over every thought, feeling, volition, and action, all was holy. Yet all was

man's own property, because man voluntarily concurred with the Holy Spirit's influence and agency. He was made "sufficient to have stood, yet free to fall." Whatever influence was exerted upon man's spiritual nature by the Holy Spirit, it was not irresistible, as all admit. The proof is patent: man fell.

§ 6. The Nature of Virtue and Sin.

There need be no controversy on the subject of virtue and sin. Those who choose to restrict those terms to voluntary acts may do so, and we shall not contend with them. Of course, in this sense, man had neither virtue nor sin when he was created. God did not endow him with *voluntary acts*; no one can imagine any thing so unphilosophical. On the other hand, if we choose to follow the Scriptures, and call the original rectitude of our nature, before any voluntary action, "righteousness and true holiness;" and the depravity of our nature, apart from voluntary action, sin, let no man take exception to it, as that might lead to an unprofitable logomachy. When John says, "Sin is the transgression of the law" (1 John iii. 4—καὶ ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐστὶν ἡ ἀνομία "and sin is lawlessness"), the Catechism cannot be far wrong in understanding him thus: "Sin is any want of conformity to, or transgression of, the law of God." Thus the principle out of which the action springs is sinful, as well as the action itself. The unregenerate man is a sinner all the time; that is his character

when asleep or at work, as well as when he is in the very act of transgressing. All jurisprudence is based on this. Thus Paul in his profound analysis of an unregenerate but awakened man, whom he personates, speaks of *sin as dwelling in him,* as well as wrought by him; indeed, he traces all actual sin to indwelling sin as its cause. "For I know that in me (that is in my flesh) dwelleth no good thing: for to will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not. For the good that I would, I do not: but the evil which I would not, that I do. Now if I do that I would not, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me." Read the whole of Rom. vii. This chapter settles the question. The next chapter tells us what he means by the "flesh," namely, fallen, corrupt nature: "For they that are after the flesh do mind the things of the flesh; but they

that are after the Spirit, the things of the Spirit. For to be carnally minded is death; but to be spiritually minded is life and peace. Because the carnal mind is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God." (Rom. viii. 5–9.) But this is the current meaning, though not of course the exclusive meaning, of σάρξ, flesh, in Paul's writings. (*Cf.* John iii. 6.) It is not worth while to contend about the use of a word, provided we agree in the thing. But the Church of England, with which we harmonize on this point, differs in regard to the thing itself from the Church of Rome. The Council of Trent holds "that by the grace of baptism the guilt of original sin is remitted, and that all is removed which hath the true and proper nature of sin;" and though the concupiscence remaining is called by the apostle sin, the Council declared that it is not true and proper sin, but is so termed because it arises from sin and inclines to it. On the contrary, the Anglican Article says, "Although there is no condemnation for those that believe and are baptized—*renatis*—yet the apostle doth confess that concupiscence and lust hath of itself the nature of sin." We abide by the apostle. There is actual sin to be forgiven by pardoning mercy, and indwelling sin to be removed by sanctifying grace.

§ 7. No Semi-Pelagianism in the Article.

The qualifying words, "*very far gone* from original righteousness," are thought by some Anglican divines to favor Semi-Pelagianism, as though they did not express a total defection from

original righteousness. But the Latin copy of the article, which is equally authentic with the English, has *quam longissime distet* —"which," says Watson, "is as strong an expression as that language can furnish," and "fixes the sense of the compilers on this point, and takes away the argument which rests on the alleged equivocalness of the English version." Indeed, there is no equivocalness in either. If it had been simply said, "man is gone from original righteousness," that would express his entire deprivation of goodness, and, as we have seen, an entire depravation of nature would be the result. But it is said man is *far gone*, "very far gone, from original righteousness:" what follows is

the certain consequence—"and is or his own nature inclined to evil;" to which our article adds, as it omits the latter part of the Ninth Article, "and that continually." No language could set forth in stronger and more explicit terms the inherited, inherent, total depravity of our nature and its incurableness apart from divine grace, for, as the General Confession expresses it, "there is no health in us," that is, no saving power. We cannot extricate ourselves from this miserable condition. In his early writings Augustin calls it *difficultas boni*. But says Ullmann:

> We recognize in human nature a prevailing inclination to sin. Neither are we able to agree to the view that the result of this inclination is only that we labor under a difficulty of good, but possess also a freedom capable in each separate instance of deciding in favor of that which is right, and thus rendering a perfectly sinless development conceivable. For as soon as the moral power is regarded as one which has to contend with inward difficulties, a perfectly pure beginning is no longer, and an internal discord is assumed irreconcilable with that sinless development which we attribute to the Lord Jesus.

Thus the Fifteenth Anglican Article, "Of Christ Alone Without Sin": "Christ in the truth of our nature was made like unto us—sin only except—but if we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us." But, thank God, in the case of all who reject not the redemption offered by Christ Jesus,

> The second Adam shall restore
> The ruins of the first.

§ 8. Proofs of the Doctrine from Personal Experience.

It might be supposed that a doctrine so important, so fundamental, so appalling, is well fortified by proofs, or no one could receive it. Alas! the proofs are only too numerous.

56

There are proofs from *personal experience*. Every man has them in his own heart. The sin of every man is there written, as with the point of a diamond. Every man knows that by nature "his heart is not right in the sight of God:" that it is "deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked." (Jer. xvii. 1, 9.) You need not go to the confessions of Paul personating the awakened but unregenerate sinner (Rom. vii.); nor to the confessions of Augustin, whose

experience corroborated his doctrine in regard to this point; nor to the confessions of Lather, or of Wesley, or of any others, who have laid bare, as far as they could, the hidden evils which they discovered in themselves: an honest and prayerful introspection will make any man adopt the penitential confession of David, and offer his prayer: “Behold, I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me. Create in me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right spirit within me.” (Ps. li.)

§ 9. Proofs from Observation.

There are proofs from *observation*. Read history, sacred and profane: what is it but a revolting record of man’s depravity? Look abroad upon the face of society, and what do you see but sin in high places and in low? sin everywhere? sin of every sort? sin in childhood, adolescence, riper age, old age, among all sorts and conditions of men? It was not only in the Psalmist’s time and place, but in every time and place. “The Lord looked down from heaven upon the children of men, to see if there were any that did understand and seek God. They are all gone aside, they are all together become filthy: there is none that doeth good, no, not one.” (Ps. xiv.; Rom. iii.) Granted that this describes actual sin—it does; but then its universality shows that it has a common origin: such a formidable stream must have a full and ever-flowing fountain. What that is we find in the account of the antediluvian world: “And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually.” (Gen. vi. 5.) It was just the same in our Lord’s time. He says, “That which cometh out of the man, that defileth the man. For from within, out of the heart of man, proceed evil thoughts, adulteries, fornications, murders, thefts, covetousness, wickedness, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, blasphemy, pride, foolishness: all these evil things come from within, and defile the man.”

(Mark vii. 20–23.) “A corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit—neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit.” (Matt. vii. 17, 18.) “Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one.” (Job xiv. 4.) Surely all observation will justify the language of Solomon, “There is not a just man upon earth that doeth good, and sinneth not”

(Eccl. vii. 20), and that of John, “If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us. If we say that we have not sinned, we make him a liar, and his word is not in us.” (1 John i. 8, 10.) But why call up the observation and testimony of others: prophets, apostles, Christ, philosophers, poets, legislators, moralists, travelers, and others? Open your eyes: look around you: the sight is appalling, overwhelming. In spite of all that has been done by God and man to stem the current, it sweeps on with resistless force. Laws, education, civilization, philosophy, nay revelation itself, all seem powerless to arrest the fearful epidemic, so widespread, so violent, so chronic, so fatal! The perusal of Dr. Dwight’s Sermons (xxix.–xxxiii.), of Fletcher’s Appeal, and of other works of this class, not only leaves no ground to question the universal and total depravity of man, but fills the soul with terror and dismay: “a horror of great darkness” falls upon the serious spectator of the sin and misery of our race, and he is ready to exclaim, “It were better for man that he had never been born.” It will drive him to insanity, unless he turns away from the revolting scene, and looks to the gracious remedy that has been provided for all our race. This will explain the seeming contradiction to the sweeping charges of the Scriptures, of universal depravity, as they do speak of the righteous, and our own observation assures us that there are such, and have been such in every age, and we have the assurance that their number will be multiplied as the ages roll along. Half the human family die in childhood, and all these are saved forever. In every nation are those who, according to their light, fear God and work righteousness: all these are saved forever. Those who have the gospel, and comply with its requirements—and there are millions of such in every age—all these are saved forever. In the latter-day glory of the Church their numbers will be vastly increased: so that where sin hath abounded, grace doth much more abound, through our Lord Jesus Christ.

58

In Him the tribes of Adam boast
More blessings than their father lost.

In a similar way the objection to the entireness of inherent and inherited depravity may be met. We are asked if among heathen nations, and among the unregenerate around us, there is not much good, as well as evil. We answer, Yes, even among those who will

be finally lost. Pelagians urge it as an objection to the doctrine of total depravity. Calvinists themselves become Semi-Pelagians at this point. If only an elect number, chosen from the common mass of sinners, are redeemed by Christ, then none others have any part or lot in the matter. Their virtues are self-originated, and, though they cannot be ignored, yet they are branded as "splendid vices," as by Augustin, and thus that Father becomes "bed-fellow" with his great opponent, Pelagius, since both attribute these virtues to unassisted human nature, though the orthodox Father stigmatizes them as disguised vices, while his heterodox opponent calls them virtues, real virtues, as indeed they are. On the Arminian, which is the scriptural, ground there is no difficulty whatever. All men are totally depraved: utterly unable, by their unassisted powers, to think, speak, or do aught that is good. But through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, who tasted death for every man, preventing grace is given to every man, given to every human being that draws the breath of life; and this so far modifies and antagonizes the depravity of our nature, that there are developed in tender infancy a thousand pleasing traits, and in every stage of subsequent life, various virtues, which, however imperfect, give a charm to individuals and society, else the world would be a pandemonium, instead of the purgatory which it has so long been, and the paradise which we hope it soon will be. In a word, every evil in the world is to be traced to our connection with the first Adam: every good to our connection with the Second.

§ 10. Scriptural Proofs.

But it may be asked. Are there no plain, explicit, positive proofs of this doctrine in the Scriptures? To this we reply, What do you consider plain, explicit, positive proofs? Do you expect to find systematic statements, dogmatic deliverances, like those in our confessions and catechisms? The Scriptures furnish

no proofs of that sort for any doctrines. But as satisfactory proofs of the doctrine of original sin are contained in the Scriptures as can be found there for any other doctrine.

1. That human nature is *inherently depraved* is plainly, explicitly,

and positively stated in such passages as these: Gen. viii. 21; Job. xv. 14–16; Prov. xxii. 15; Eccl. vii. 29; ix. 3; Jer. xvii. 9; Matt. vii. 11; xv. 19; Rom. viii. 5–9; 1 John i. 8; ii. 2; v. 19; and many other passages cited in this discussion, and a multitude besides.

2. That this depravity is *universal*, extending through every age and in every clime, is plainly, explicitly, and positively stated in Gen. vi. 11, 12; 1 Kings viii. 46; Ps. xiv. 2, 3; Eccl. vii. 20; Isa. liii. 6; Rom. iii. 9–19; 2 Cor. v. 14; Eph. ii. 1–3; 1 John ii. 2; v. 19; and many other passages previously cited, and a great many besides.
3. That this depravity is *total* in the case of every man, apart from preventing or renewing grace, is plainly, explicitly, and positively stated in such passages as these: Gen. vi. 5; John iii. 3–8; Rom. vii. 18; viii. 5–9; and many other passages previously cited, and others of like import.
4. That this depravity is *hereditary*, as well as *inherent, universal*, and *total*, is plainly, explicitly, and positively stated in Job xi. 12; xiv. 4; xv. 14; xxv. 4; Ps. li. 5; John iii. 6; Rom. v. 12–21; 1 Cor. xv. 21, 22, 45–49; and other passages cited in this discussion, and many besides.

These texts are not, of course, equally plain, explicit, and positive; but when carefully examined, taken together, compared with the general scope of revelation, in view of our own experience and observation, they constitute a mass of evidence which cannot be resisted.

§ 11. Conclusion.

The depravity of our race is thus shown to be *inherent*, wrought into the very warp and woof of our *nature*, hence it is well called, as previously explained, *natural* depravity; *universal*, extending over all the world and through all succeeding generations; *total*, embracing all the powers of our nature, and comprehending every thought, word, and action, except as antagonized by divine grace; and *hereditary*, as it is “Original or Birth Sin:” that which we bring with us into the world, a fearful patrimony, a sad inheritance!

A thorough acquaintance with this doctrine, and a firm persuasion of its truth, prepares the way for a hearty and grateful reception of the atonement in Christ, by which we may be recovered from the ruins of the fall and be

Restored to our unsinning state,
To love's sweet paradise.

[It still remains true that man was not *dehumanized* (if the term may be pardoned) by the fall. He continued man. He did not sink to the level of the beasts, nor was there such a breaking down of his faculties as to place him in the category of idiots. Reason and conscience, or the elements of the natural image of God, remained as the avenues of divine approach for the reconstruction of the moral image. Man, as man, was within reach of God—was salvable. Holiness does not consist in the possession of a conscience—very vile criminals sometimes evince their possession of conscience—but in uniform obedience to its commands. Reason remains as a capability of the knowledge of God, and as making man a fit recipient of the truths of divine revelation. Beasts, with their present constitution, cannot be approached concerning morality or religion by either human or divine agencies. The truth that *man is man*, and that God deals with him as possessing those essential characteristics without which he would cease to be human, is evidently consistent with the doctrine of inherent, natural, universal, total, and hereditary depravity as taught above.]

---

1. "History of Doctrines," Vol. II., p. 251—T.↩
2. "History of Doctrines," Vol. II., p. 254.—T.↩

Part II.

Article VIII.
Of Free-will.

61

The condition of man after the fall of Adam is such that he cannot turn and prepare himself, by his own natural strength and works, to faith, and calling upon God; wherefore we have no power to do good works, pleasant and acceptable to God, without the grace of God by Christ preventing us, that we may have a good will, and working with us, when we have that good will.

Introduction.

This is copied *verbatim* from Article X. of the Anglican Confession, except that Mr. Wesley omitted the word "good" prefixed to "works" where this word first occurs; the language is stronger by the omission.

This article is complemental to the preceding on Original Sin; and in the Forty-two Articles of 1552 it was followed by another of a similarly complemental character, to-wit:

> The grace of Christ, or the Holy Ghost by him given, doth take away the stony heart and giveth an heart of flesh. And although those who have no will to good things, he maketh them will, and those that would evil things, he maketh them not to will, yet nevertheless he enforceth not the will. And therefore no man, when he sinneth, can excuse himself as not worthy to be blamed or condemned, by alleging that he sinned unwillingly or by compulsion.

This article, "Of Grace," was omitted in the Thirty-nine Articles to conciliate the Calvinists.

The article on Free-will, as it stood in 1552, began with the words, "We have no power," and was borrowed in substance from St. Augustin. The former part was prefixed in 1562 by Archbishop Parker, who took it substantially from the Württemberg Confession.

In the article as set forth in 1552 and 1562, it reads "working *in* us" but as set forth in 1571, it is "working *with* us:" this better expresses the meaning of the Latin *co-operante*, and is equally

scriptural.

Chapter I.
Free-will and Inability.

§ 1. Pelagianism, Semi-Pelagianism, and their Modifications Condemned.

62

This article is leveled against Pelagianism and Semi-Pelagianism, and the modifications thereof by the Schoolmen and Romanists.

As the Pelagians denied the doctrine of inherent, inherited, and total depravity, they consistently held that men can begin, continue, and end every good work without "the internal succors of the Divine Spirit:" "external grace alone being necessary to excite their endeavors."

The Semi-Pelagians—who are traced to the monk Cassian, who came from the East, and founded a monastery at Marseilles, in the fourth century—held that men without preventing grace are capable of faith and holy desires, but that they cannot persevere in the virtuous course which they have the power of beginning, without the perpetual support and the powerful assistance of divine grace.

The Schoolmen generally inclined to Semi-Pelagianism. The Thomists held that man, by God's aid, can merit eternal life: this is called the merit of *condignity*. The Scotists held that man in his natural state can so live as to deserve the grace of God by which he may obtain salvation, this natural fitness for grace being such as to oblige God to grant it: this is the merit of *congruity*. The Thirteenth Article of the Anglican Confession is leveled against this Scotist figment; but as the present article opposes it, the former was not incorporated into our Confession. The controversy between the Thomists and the Scotists was revived by the Romish doctors at the time of the Reformation. The Jesuits were, and still are, generally Pelagians or Semi-Pelagians. Two distinguished divines of this Order, Leonard Less and John Hamel, boldly advanced the Pelagian system; their views were condemned by the Faculties of

63

the University of Louvain and of Douay; but Mayence, Treves, and Ingolstadt declared for the Jesuits. Subsequently, the Jansenists,

who were popish Calvinists, opposed the Jesuits, but made small headway against their enemies, who were favored by the pope.

§ 2. "New Divinity" in New England: Parable of the Great Supper.

The Socinians and their followers, the Unitarians, being generally Pelagians or Semi-Pelagians, oppose the doctrine of this article. So also do the so-called New Divinity men of this country. "The three main points of New England theology, in Professor Park's view, are 'that sin consists in choice, that our natural power equals, and that it also limits our duty.'" This New Divinity is essentially Pelagian, as it denies that sin is in the nature of man, but only in his voluntary actions, and affirms that man has the natural ability to do what God requires. They generally, however, hold, like other Calvinists, to the dogma of election, and maintain that no one ever did so exercise that natural ability as thereby to secure salvation: as a matter of fact, they say none are saved but the elect, who are *made* "willing in the day of God's power." Such are the inconsistencies of error. They illustrate the subject by a perversion of the parable of the great supper (Luke xiv.). All are invited to it; there is enough for all; all have the natural ability to come, but none have the moral ability: therefore none come to the feast. But that there may not be an entire failure, the maker of the feast selects some of the delinquents, and forces them to come or makes them willing, *i. e.*, gives them a moral, as well as a natural, ability to come. Thus they fancy they reconcile what they call "divine sovereignty" to free agency. How strange that they do not detect the sophistry in this argument! The fallacious use of the terms natural and moral is transparent. The act to be performed is a moral act, and the moral inability to perform it is natural to every man (apart from divine assistance), so that there is no contrast between *natural* and *moral*. The question is not whether all men have intellect, sensibility, and will, as without these natural faculties none would be men: these are the essential attributes of humanity. But if for any reason they are incapable, without extrinsic aid, of using those faculties for the performance

of any virtuous action, then the inability is both natural and moral: it is natural, because it results from their natural depravity, the sin

that dwelleth in them, and with which they were born; and moral, because it has respect to moral subjects, involving duty and responsibility. The arbitrary selection of a few from the great mass of delinquents, all alike rejecting the invitation, may excite the wonder and gratitude and joy of *the elect*, the exclusive favorites of the master of the feast, but would hardly produce similar sentiments in the bosoms of the reprobate.

Did not the Lord know when he "spread the feast," and gave the universal invitation to it, that none would come, that none could come to it, unless something else were done to bring them in? and that it was tantalizing them to invite them to come when they could not come without that aid, which he would not give them? The true state of the case is this: All men alike are naturally incapable of turning to God and doing his will, without preventing and co-operating grace; all are alike capable of doing so, by that grace which is offered to all; and none use that grace who might not refuse it, and none refuse it who might not use it; so that there is no mystery about it, no difficulty whatever, no reconciliation called for of divine sovereignty with human responsibility. No one is damned for his natural inability to do the will of God, but for spurning the offer of grace by which he might be enabled to do it.

§ 3. What Is Meant by Free-will?

Let us now more minutely examine what is meant by Free-will —*Liberum Arbitrium*.

There is an apparent tautology in this phrase, *Free-will.* The adjective may indeed be used merely as a descriptive epithet, not implying that there may be a bound-will, as we say "saving grace," using the epithet as descriptive, without implying that there is any "damning grace." But as the divines of the age when this article was written spoke of "the bondage of the will," as being by nature free only to evil, and incapable of good, it may be so used in this place. Hence, in the body of the article the epithet "good" is used twice in reference to the will when rectified by grace. Apart from grace the will is bad, because the man's nature is so bad that of himself he cannot choose that

which is right. We are speaking of man as he stands related to the

first Adam, and as he must ever remain, if we can conceive of any one having a separate existence apart from the Second Adam. Indeed, the sinner who has lived without God in the world, when he is illuminated and awakened by the Holy Spirit, laments and deplores this wretched condition.

Since by thy light myself I see
Naked, and poor, and void of thee—
Thou know'st the baseness of my mind,
Wayward, and impotent, and blind;
Thou know'st how unsubdued my will,
Averse to good and prone to ill;
Thou know'st how wide my passions rove,
Nor checked by fear, nor charmed by love.

Again:

Fain would I know my utmost ill,
And groan my nature's weight to feel—
To feel the clouds that round me roll,
The night that hangs upon my soul,
The darkness of my carnal mind,
My will perverse, my passions blind,
Scattered o'er all the earth abroad,
Immeasurably far from God.

The discovery of this "condition of man after the fall of Adam" is the first result of preventing grace. It is necessary to see "the exceeding sinfulness of sin," as it is set forth in Rom. vii., so that we may exclaim, "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from this body of death?" that we may be prepared for the answer, "Jesus Christ our Lord."

The old writers frequently speak of the will as comprehending the affections. Thus Arminius in his Declaration of Sentiments—III., "The Free-will of Man," says:

In his primitive condition, as he came out of the hands of his Creator, he was endowed with such a portion of knowledge, holiness, and power, as enabled him to understand, esteem, consider, will, and to perform the true good, according to the commandment delivered to him; yet none of these acts could he do, except through the assistance of divine grace. But in his lapsed and sinful state man is not capable, of and by himself, either to think, to will, or to do that which is really good; but it is necessary for him to be regenerated and renewed in his intellect, *affections or will*, and in all

his powers, by God in Christ through the Holy Spirit, that he may be qualified rightly to understand, esteem, consider, will, and perform whatever is truly good. When he is made a partaker of this regeneration or renovation, I consider that, since he is delivered from sin, he is capable of thinking,

66

willing, and doing that which is good, but yet not without the continued aids of divine grace.

Here he speaks of the "affections or will," as though they were interchangeable expressions. Elsewhere he distinguishes between them, and also shows that all the acts preparatory to regeneration and renovation are performed by the aid of preventing grace. But in all the process he holds that man has the power of alternate choice; he can, by the promptings of native depravity, reject the offered grace, while he can choose to receive that grace which enables him to make that initial choice, and then to will and to do all that God requires.

John Wesley sometimes speaks of the will as the self-determining power of the soul. Thus, in his Sermon (108) on "What is Man?" he says: "By a single act of my will I put my head, eyes, hands, or any part of my body, into motion."

Yet just before he says:

This inward principle, wherever it is lodged, is capable not only of thinking, but likewise of love, hatred, joy, sorrow, desire, fear, hope, etc., and a whole train of other inward emotions, which are commonly called passions or affections. They are styled, by a general appellation, the will, and are mixed and diversified a thousand ways; and they seem to be the only spring of action in that inward principle we call the soul.

In our present psychology we do not so speak of the will; but we make it as distinct from the affections as from the intellect;[1] and so indeed does Wesley, by another name:

I am conscious to myself of one more property called "liberty." This is very frequently confounded with the will, but it is of a very different nature. Neither is it a property of the will, but a distinct property of the soul, capable of being exerted with regard to all the faculties of the soul, as well as all the motions of the body. It is a power of self-determination, which, although it does not extend to all our thoughts and imaginations, yet extends to our words and actions in general, and not with many exceptions. I am full as certain of this, that I am free, with respect to these, to speak or not to speak, to act or not to act, to do this or the contrary, as I am of my own existence. I have not only what is termed a "liberty of

contradiction"—a power to do or not to do; but what is termed a "liberty of contrariety"—a power to act one way or the contrary. To deny this would be to deny the constant experience of all human kind. Every one feels that he has an inherent power to move this or that part of his body, to move it or not, and to move this way or the contrary, just as he pleases. I can, as I choose (and so can every man that is born of woman), open or shut my eyes;

speak or be silent; rise or sit down; stretch out my hand, or draw it in; and use any of my limbs according to my pleasure, as well as my whole body. And although I have not an absolute power over my own mind, because of the corruption of my own nature; yet, through the grace of God assisting me, I have a power to choose and do good, as well as evil. I am free to choose whom I will serve; and, if I choose the better part, to continue therein even unto death.

That is what we call the freedom of the will: it is indeed the freedom of a moral agent. It reminds us of Dr. Johnson's curt and sensible saying, "Man is free, and he knows it; and there is an end of it." Bishop Burnet discourses to the same effect:

A question arises out of this, whether the will is not always determined by the understanding, so that a man does always choose and determine himself upon the account of some idea or other. If this is granted, then no liberty will be left to our faculties. We must apprehend things as they are proposed to our understanding; for if a thing appears true to us, we must assent to it; and if the will is as blind to the understanding as the understanding is determined by the light in which the object appears to it, then we seem to be concluded under a fate or necessity. It is, after all, a vain attempt to argue against every man's experience. We perceive in ourselves a liberty of turning our minds to some ideas, or from others; we can think longer or shorter of these, more exactly and steadily, or more slightly and superficially, as we please; and in this radical freedom of directing or diverting our thoughts, a main part of our freedom does consist. Often objects as they appear to our thoughts do so affect or heat them that they seem to conquer us, and carry us after them—some thoughts seeming, as it were, to intoxicate and charm us. Appetites and passions, when much fired by objects apt to work upon them, do agitate us strongly; and, on the other hand, the impressions of religion come often into our minds with such a secret force, so much of terror, and such secret joy mixing with them, that they seem to master us; yet in all this a man acts freely, because he thinks and chooses for himself; and though perhaps he does not feel himself so entirely balanced that he is indifferent to both sides, yet he has still such a remote liberty that he can turn himself to other objects and thoughts, so that he can divert, if not all of a sudden resist, the

present impressions that seem to master him. We do also feel that in many trifles we do act with an entire liberty, and do many things upon no other account, and for no other reason, but because we will do them; and yet more important things depend on these.

That is a very judicious remark. It is a matter of consciousness —with which reason has but little to do, though it does not contradict it—that we have a self-determining power; and though there is generally some reason why we choose *this*, and refuse *that*, yet we are conscious of freedom in so doing. We are not necessitated to do so by any thing antecedent within us, or any thing brought to bear upon us from without; we are conscious that we can act freely, we hold ourselves responsible for our

action, and God and man alike hold us responsible for it. How useless, then, to argue against it!

There are some things so entirely indifferent in their character that we perform them without any thought or concern about them: nothing whatever influences us one way or the other.

In questions of importance we are influenced by considerations presented to our minds; but still our autonomy is not infringed. There may be considerations of a contrary character: we decide to which we will yield, and act accordingly.

Freedom and responsibility would be destroyed, or set aside, if we were necessitated to act according to motives over which we have no control, as truly as if some stronger power were to lay hands upon us, and mechanically force us to do any act contrary to our will.

§ 4. Inability of Man.

We are now prepared to account for man's inability to will and to do good works pleasant and acceptable to God.

The article traces it to "the fall of Adam," and our relation to it. By this, as is set forth in the Seventh Article, we are involved in moral depravity, inherent, inherited, total, and universal, such a "condition" as is absolutely hopeless, apart from divine grace, so hopeless that Adam would not have been allowed to "engender" his posterity had there not been a redemption provided for them in "the grace of God by Christ."

This depravity, as we have seen, affects our entire nature. The intellect is blinded and reduced to a state of ineptitude in regard to divine things. “Having the understanding darkened, being alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them.” (Eph. iv. 18.) The sensibility is obtunded by apathy as to good, and inflamed and excited by concupiscence as to evil. The will, accordingly, is perverse naturally, and, without divine interposition, inevitably “averse to good, and prone to ill.” Here is the bondage of the will. Self-determination—the power of volition—remains. But who is the subject? and what are the objects of choice? The subject is one whose nature is utterly depraved; and “a corrupt tree cannot bring forth good fruit.” It is impossible for a man in this state to will and to do works pleasant and acceptable to God. How can a man whose intellect is in a state of utter blindness and ineptitude as to divine things make choice of them and perform

them? How can a man whose sensibility is obtunded, being “past feeling” as to any thing good, and who is filled with concupiscence, a love and a longing for all evil, choose the good and reject the evil? He simply cannot do it. “So, then, they that are in the flesh cannot please God.” A man in this condition not only freely chooses according to the motives presented by his intellect and sensibility, that is, according to his nature; but he cannot choose to the contrary, unless contrary motives are presented to him, his intellect being enlightened and his sensibility affected by divine grace.

This is the teaching of the article. It not only opposes the Pelagians, but also the Semi-Pelagians, of whatever class, Patristic, Scholastic, Romish, or Neo-Calvinistic.

The early intemperate utterances of Luther concerning the natural bondage of the will, either to God or the devil, according to the Augustinian scheme of absolute and unconditional predestination, which he then held, but afterward repudiated, or modified, or ignored, were discussed in the Council of Trent, which had the advantage of the Reformer on this subject. But as the Franciscans and Dominicans in the Council antagonized each other on this question, the Council endeavored to steer a middle course, though it evidently leaned to the Franciscan, Scotist, or Semi-Pelagian party, against the Dominicans, who were Thomists and Augustinians. The Council condemned those who said that “since the sin of Adam free-will is lost.” That was leveled against Luther;

but the Dominicans were pacified by the assertion of the necessity of preventing grace. The Council, perhaps, would say that free-will, the capacity of choosing good or evil, is not wanting to man, in view of the redemption by Christ: that would make their deliverance quadrate with our article, with the Scriptures, and our own experience.

---

1. Psychologists, as stated above, ordinarily classify the powers of mind as (1) intellect, (2) sensibility, and (3) will. Before the time of Kant (1724–1804) the division was into (1) understanding, and (2) will; the emotional nature, including emotions proper, appetites, desires, and affections, being undistinguished from will.—T. ↩

Chapter II.
Preventing and Co-operating Grace.

70

We come now to show how this natural inability may be overcome. The article says, by preventing and by co-operating grace.

§ 1. Grace Defined.

It will be expedient first to inquire what is meant by "grace." Χάρις (Heb. *chain*), *gratia*, denotes generally that which gives pleasure or gratification. Hence it is used in the Scriptures for acceptable or eloquent speech (Luke iv. 22; Eph. iv. 29; Col. iv. 6; *cf.* Ps. xiv. 2); it is used also as an accusative for *in favor of, on account of* and the like (Luke vii. 47; Eph. iii. 1). It is used for favor, good-will (Rom. v. 17), and frequently for an act of favor or kindness, or the gratification resulting from a benefit conferred (Rom. iv. 4; 2 Cor. i. 15, and elsewhere); also for gratitude, a return for a favor received (Luke vi. 32–34; xvii. 9, *et al.*) But theologians use the word also to denote the influence of the Holy Spirit upon the soul of man, exerted to promote his salvation. Thus the article on Grace, in the Confession of 1552, already cited, says: "The grace of Christ, or the Holy Ghost by him given, doth take away the stony heart and giveth an heart of flesh." In Watson's "Biblical and Theological Dictionary," under the word "Grace," we read, after the scriptural definitions of the word:

> In theological language grace also signifies divine influence upon the soul; and it derives the name from this being the effect of the great grace, or favor, of God to mankind. Austin defines inward actual grace to be the inspiration of love, which prompts us to practice according to what we know, out of a religious affection and compliance. he says, likewise, that the grace of God is the blessing of God's sweet influence, whereby we are induced to take pleasure in that which he commands, to desire and to love it; and that if God does not prevent us with this blessing, what he commands not only is not perfected, but is not so much as begun in us. Without the inward grace of Jesus Christ man is not able to do the least thing that is good. He stands in need of this grace to begin, continue, and finish all the good he does, or, rather, which God does in him, and with

him, by his grace. This grace is free; it is not due to us; if it were due to us it would be no more grace; it would be a debt. (Rom. xi. 6.) It is in its nature an assistance so powerful and efficacious that it surmounts the obstinacy of the most rebellious human heart, without destroying human liberty.

71

In this sense the word "grace" is frequently used in the Liturgy. Thus in the title of "The Third Collect" to be used in the Morning Service—"for Grace." The word does not occur in the Collect, but this is what it designates:

> Grant that this day we fall into no sin; neither run into any kind of danger; but that all our doings may be ordered by thy governance, to do always that is righteous in thy sight, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

So in the prayer for the Supreme Rulers:

> So replenish them with the grace of thy Holy Spirit that they may always incline to thy will, and walk in thy way.

So in other Collects and Prayers—as three times in the Litany.

But the best description of preventing, accompanying, and consummating grace is in that noble prayer in the Ordination Service, which reads as if inspired by the Holy Spirit:

> Prevent us, O Lord, in all our doings, with thy most gracious favor, and further us with thy continual help, that in all our works, begun, continued, and ended in thee, we may glorify thy holy name, and finally, by thy mercy, obtain everlasting life, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.[1]

The leading principle of the Semi-Pelagians is "that man, before he receives grace, is capable of faith and holy desires:" this our article denies. How strange that there should have always been a leaven of this heresy in the Anglican Church! Yet such is the case. Thus Hook, in his "Church Dictionary," Art. GRACE, says:

> Though human nature is greatly depraved, yet every good disposition is not totally extinguished, nor is all power of right action entirely annihilated. Men may therefore make some spontaneous, though feeble, attempt to act conformably to their duty, which will be promoted and rendered effectual by the co-operation of God's grace; or the grace of God may so far "prevent" our actual endeavors as to awaken and dispose us to our duty, but yet not in such a degree that we cannot withstand its influence.

It seems we may take either alternative, Semi-Pelagianism or orthodoxy!

There is no objection to the use of the word “grace” in the theological as well as the scriptural sense. Bishop Burnet well remarks: “There are inward assistances given to us in the new dispensation. I do not dispute whether these are fitly called *grace*, for perhaps that word will scarce be found in that sense in the Scriptures.” We do not dispute about it. We use it in both senses, as in the beautiful hymn of Dr. Doddridge on “Grace;”

Grace first contrived the way
To save rebellious man;
And all the steps *that* grace display
Which drew the wondrous plan.

There is grace in the scriptural sense.

Grace taught my wand’ring feet
To tread the heavenly road.
And new supplies each hour I meet
While pressing on to God.

There is grace in the theological sense: preventing, accompanying, and consummating. Thus he says, “Grace all the work shall crown!” The Wesleys use it in this sense freely in their hymns.

§ 2. “Free Grace:” In All and For All.

The expression “free grace” is ambiguous. It means that God’s favor to us is undeserved: *it is free in all.* But then it also means that *it is free for all.* This is well set forth by Wesley in his sermon on “Free Grace,” by which Mr. Whitefield was offended, but for which he ought to have thanked his friend, as the unanswerable arguments against the theory of “particular redemption” ought to have encouraged him in flying like a seraph over the world, preaching salvation to all men, as Wesley shows from the Scripture that the grace is free for all. Why preach it to all, if all have not an interest in it? In opening his sermon Wesley says:

> How freely does God love the world! While we were yet sinners, “Christ died for the ungodly.” While we were “dead in sin,” God “spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all.” And how freely with him does he “give us all things!” Verily, Free Grace is all in all!

The grace or love of God, whence cometh our salvation, is free in all, and free for all.

First. It is free in all to whom it is given. It does not depend on any power or merit in man; no, not in any degree, neither in whole nor in part. It does not in any wise depend either on the good works or righteousness of the receiver; not on any thing he has done, or any thing he is. It does not depend on his endeavors. 73 It does not depend on his good tempers, or good desires, or good purposes and intentions; for all these flow from the free grace of God; they are the streams only, not the fountain. They are the fruits of free grace, and not the root. They are not the cause, but the effects of it. Whatsoever good is in man or is done by man, God is the author and doer of it. Thus is his grace free in all; that is, no way depending on any power or merit in man, but on God alone, who freely gave us his own Son, and "with him freely giveth us all things."

But is it free for all, as well as in all? To this some have answered, "No; it is free only for those whom God hath ordained to life; and they are but a little flock. The greater part of mankind God hath ordained to death; and it is not free for them. Them God hateth; and therefore, before they were born, decreed they should die eternally. And this he absolutely decreed; because so was his good pleasure; because it was his sovereign will. Accordingly, they are born for this—to be destroyed, body and soul, in hell. And they grow up under the irrevocable curse of God, without any possibility of redemption; for what grace God gives he gives only for this, to increase, not prevent, their damnation."

Wesley then refutes the dogma in question, and shows that as *grace* is free *in* all, so also is it free *for* all.

§ 3. Regeneration Defined.

There is another term, which, though it does not occur in this article, is found in our Seventeenth (Anglican Twenty-seventh) Article, viz.: "regeneration" and the cognate "born again" (Latin, *regenerati*), in the Fifteenth Anglican, and is frequently used in the discussion of this subject, which it might be well to define.

Palingenesia, *regeneratio* occurs but twice in the New Testament. In Matt. xix. 28 it refers to the renovation, or restoration, which is to be consummated at the second coming of Christ. In Titus iii. 5, 6: "According to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost, which he shed on us abundantly:" this refers to baptism; and the phrase "washing," or *laver*, "of regeneration," may mean the washing effected by

regeneration, or the washing symbolical of regeneration. If the former, then regeneration stands for baptism, according to the use of the word by the Fathers; if the latter, then "the washing" means baptism, and regeneration means the renewing of the Holy Ghost, and is joined to the washing to limit the idea. It is not every washing that is baptism; that washing alone is baptism which is the washing of regeneration, an application of water as a solemn pledge and symbol of the regenerating grace of the Holy Spirit.

74

Dr. Knapp ("Christian Theology," Sec. 126) says:

> Baptism is called, Tit. iii. 5, λουτρὸν παλινγενεσίας, because we are not only solemnly admitted by this rite into the Christian Society, but are likewise thereby obligated, according to the precepts of Christ, to become reformed in character; and on this condition have all the rights and rewards of God's children granted and assured to us. So the Rabbins expressed themselves with regard to the baptism of proselytes. And for this reason the most ancient Fathers, Ignatius and Justin, call baptism ἀναγέννησις.

The Fathers commonly use the word regeneration for baptism: sometimes they embrace in it what is called "the grace of baptism," but what we call the thing signified by baptism, namely, "the renewing of the Holy Ghost." This ambiguous use of the word led to the preposterous dogma of baptismal regeneration, as held by papists and others. There could be no objection to the use of the word regeneration as denoting baptism, by which men are introduced into a new state—into the visible Church of Christ—if those who so use it would confine it to that meaning, and not under it sophistically introduce the idea of spiritual regeneration. To illustrate: we might use the address in the Anglican Office for Private Baptism of Children: "Seeing now, dearly beloved, that this child is by baptism regenerate, and grafted into the body of Christ's Church," etc. But we could not proceed with the thanksgiving: "We yield thee most hearty thanks, most merciful Father, that it hath pleased thee to regenerate this infant with thy Holy Spirit," etc.

The former might simply mean a ritual, external regeneration, the admission into the kingdom of God visibly and outwardly considered, as in John iii. 5, where to be born of water is to be baptized, and to be born of the Spirit is to experience the inward, spiritual change which baptism symbolizes, and which in the thanksgiving is attributed to baptism.

The only plausible interpretation that can be given to the

language, “it hath pleased thee to regenerate this infant with thy Holy Spirit,” is that which makes every act of the Church and its ministers an act of the Spirit, as every act is done under his authority, superintendence, and sanction, according to 1 Cor. xii. But Moberly, in his Bampton Lectures (1868) on “The Administration of the Holy Spirit in the Body of Christ,” runs this into a mystic and scarcely intelligible form of baptismal regeneration, involving some kind of change of nature produced in the infant, in or by baptism.

75

This ambiguous and sophistical use of terms is found in the Catechism of the Church of England, where the catechumen is made to say that a sacrament is “an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace;” and immediately to add, that there are two parts in the sacrament, the outward and visible sign, and the inward spiritual grace! Water is the outward visible sign, and the inward spiritual grace is “a death unto sin, and a new birth unto righteousness; for, being by nature born in sin, and the children of wrath, we are hereby made the children of grace.” That is, the thing signified by baptism is the second part of baptism, the sacrament symbolizing one of its parts, and this part, the renewing of the soul, the new birth unto righteousness! What contradiction! What dangerous doctrine! The Twenty-seventh Article of the Anglican Confession gives no such uncertain sound: “Baptism is a sign of regeneration, or new birth.” Here the word regeneration is used to denote the inward spiritual change effected by the Holy Spirit.

Thus Knapp paraphrases John iii. 3, 5: “Whoever is not born of baptism and the Holy Spirit (*i. e.*, does not consecrate himself by baptism to the profession of my religion, and does not become, through divine assistance, *a reformed man, a child of God*, a friend of God, like him in moral character), cannot be considered a member of the Messiah’s kingdom.”[2]

It is to be noted that the cognate terms, “born again,” “begotten of God,” etc., used so frequently in the First Epistle of

76

John, denote the inward, spiritual change, without any reference to baptism. (*Cf.* 1 Pet. i. 23.)

Some extend the meaning of regeneration so as to comprehend all the work of the Holy Spirit from the first operation of preventing

grace to the last touch of consummating grace. Thus Bishop Browne, whose discourse on this article is ambiguous and self-contradictory: “Passages which speak of new birth and new creation show plainly that God’s grace prevents us, waits not, that is, for us to make advances to him, but graciously comes forward to help us, whilst yet we are without strength.” That is the dialect of Calvinism. We are dead, and can do nothing till we are brought to life. We are born in sin, and can do nothing till we are born again. In birth and in resurrection the subject is utterly passive, therefore we are utterly passive in regeneration—can do nothing till we are regenerated by the Holy Ghost. Strange that men do not see that they are making figures run on all fours! Strange that they do not see that before any one is made a child of God by regenerating grace, he has to use preventing grace so as to repent, believe, and call upon God. “As many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name.” (John i. 12.) “For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus.” (Gal. iii. 26.) Hence the exhortation, “Repent ye therefore, and be converted [or turn to God] that your sins may be blotted out, when [or so that] the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord.” (Acts iii. 19.) Hence the prayer for regenerating or renewing grace: “Hide thy face from my sins, and blot out all mine iniquities. Create in me a clean heart, O God; and renew a right spirit within me. Cast me not away from thy presence; and take not thy Holy Spirit from me.” (Ps. li. 9–11.) All this has no meaning, it is a preposterous impertinence, if we are not conducted by preventing grace through a preparatory process of penitence, “faith and calling upon God,” for pardon and renewal, before we experience justification and regeneration. What are all those acts and exercises in Augustin’s “Confessions” and in Romans vii., if we can do nothing by preventing grace in order to realize justifying and regenerating grace? Watson gives no uncertain sound on this subject. He says of regeneration:

> It is that mighty change in man, wrought by the Holy Spirit, by which the

> dominion which sin has over him in his natural state, and which he deplores and struggles against in his penitent state, is broken and abolished, so that, with full choice of will and the energy of right affections he serves God freely, and runs in the way of his commandments.

He then proceeds to prove that regeneration is not repentance, and does not begin with repentance, which belongs to the preparatory process which has regeneration in view. Regeneration "is as special and instant a work of God as justification, and for this reason, that it is not attained before the pardon of our sins, and always accompanies it."

§ 4. Preventing Grace.

Having thus settled the meaning of the terms employed in this discussion, it is an easy task to show how the inability of nature is overcome, first by preventing, and then by co-operating grace. And first, let us notice preventing grace.

As we have seen, a man will continue choosing and doing evil, unless by divine influence he is shown what is good and urged to choose it. Now preventing grace is that influence. It precedes our action, and gives us the capacity to will and to do right, enlightening the intellect, and exciting the sensibility. Everything that is done for the sinner by providential dispensations, by divine revelation, Christian institutions, "the means of grace," as they are significantly styled, and all other agencies, is employed by the Holy Spirit in this economy of preventing grace. All this is so brought to bear upon the sinner that he can be the subject of "faith and calling upon God," if he chooses; or, if he chooses, he can decline to do so, and "do despite to the Spirit of grace." [Mr. Wesley, in his sermon on "Working out Our Own Salvation," says:

> For, allowing that all the souls of men are dead in sin by *nature*, this excuses none, seeing there is no man that is in a state of mere nature; there is no man, unless he has quenched the Spirit, that is wholly void of the grace of God.3

§ 5. Co-operating Grace.

Then, as to co-operating grace. The term is well chosen—in the Latin *co-operante*, "working with us." Brown says:

> The doctrine of co-operation has been opposed by many as assigning too much strength to man. Man, say they, is altogether too weak either to begin the work of grace, or even, after that work is begun, to contribute

any thing toward its completion. It is patching the pure robe of Christ's righteousness to add any of the filthy rags of man's works to it.

78

The old Calvinists dealt out an infinite amount of such nonsense; but we do not hear much of it these times.

The word *co-operante* was expressed, in the first English recension of the article, by "working in us;" but in 1572 the closer and better rendering, "working with us," was substituted. Grace works in us, of course; but it cannot work *in* us, after the initial operation, without working *with* us.

Thomas Aquinas says: "God works good in us without our co-operation, but not without our consent." This subtile distinction is worthless. Our consent, or concurrence, is necessarily co-operant. On what does grace operate? On an intelligent, sentient, passive nature? On a will that has no conative power? Does it operate by coaction, coercion? Does it do all that it shows us ought to be done, and that it excites us to have done? That is to say, does the Holy Spirit begin and continue to pour light into our minds, while we passively receive it, and never use it? Does he invite, and warn, and strive, and woo us to let him repent, and pray, and believe, and do good works for us, while we merely consent that he should do so? Verily, the angelical doctor, as Aquinas is called, was as capable of absurdity as if he bore a less pretentious title! If "angelical," he is far from being *evangelical*. Co-operating grace is exerted by suggesting, sustaining, confirming operations, all of which imply an active as well as a passive subject. Grace cannot operate except on a free moral agent. The greatest saint is dependent every moment upon co-operating grace for all the good he experiences, and for all the good he performs.

Every moment, Lord, I want
The merit of thy death.

But that merit is appropriated by faith, and faith cannot be exercised by the Holy Spirit without the subject, nor by the subject without the Holy Spirit. What is this but co-operation? So of all other holy acts and exercises. The works are ours, the power to perform them comes from God. Thus he works *with* us by working *in* us. This is set forth with exquisite precision in that beautiful hymn of Charles Wesley beginning:

Father, to thee my soul I lift,

My soul on thee depends,
Convinced that every perfect gift
From thee alone descends.

79

The law of plasticity here obtains. There is a plasticity in the agent —the capacity of molding, and shaping, and stamping, according to his own model. Then there is a plasticity in the subject—the susceptibility of being thus molded, and shaped, and stamped. The potter cannot mold a flint bowlder as he molds the clay. So far the simile holds; and it is very expressive. But let it go on all fours, and see what comes of it (Watts's Hymns i. 117):

Behold the potter and the clay,
He forms his vessels as he please:
Such is our God and such are we,
The subject of his just decrees.

Doth not the workman's power extend
O'er all the mass, which part to choose
And mold it for a nobler end.
And which to leave for viler use?

May not the Sovereign Lord on high
Dispense his favors as he will—
Choose some to life while others die—
And yet be just and gracious still?

That is, man is mere clay. Clay has no power to operate with or against the power of the potter, therefore man, a moral agent, a responsible intelligence, with intellect, sensibility, and will, is just as powerless, just as passive, and as void of concurrent action, as clay in the hands of the potter. Did ever any one hear clay ask the potter to make it into the shape of any vessel? Yet there never was a Christian that did not say in substance:

Lo, in thy hands I lie.
And wait thy will to prove;
My Potter, stamp on me thy clay.
Thy only stamp of love!

What sophistry is concealed under metaphors and analogies!

We strengthen our argument by citing the admirable Section, No. IV., in the Letter of Arminius to Hippolytus a Collibus:

Concerning grace and free-will, this is what I teach, according to the Scriptures and orthodox consent: Free-will is unable to begin or perfect any true and spiritual good, without grace. That I may not be said, like Pelagius, to practice delusion with regard to the word "grace," I mean by it that which is the grace of Christ, and which belongs to regeneration. I affirm, therefore, that this grace is simply and absolutely necessary for the illumination of the mind, the due ordering of the affections, and the inclination of the will to that which is good. It is this grace which

operates on the mind, the affections, and the will; which infuses good thoughts into the mind, inspires good desires into the affections, and bends the will to carry into execution good thoughts and good desires. This grace [*praevenit*] goes before, accompanies, and follows—it excites, assists, operates that we will, and co-operates lest we will in vain. It averts temptations, assists and grants success in the midst of temptations, sustains man against the flesh, the world, and Satan, and in this great contest grants to man the enjoyment of the victory. It raises up again those who are conquered and have fallen, establishes and supplies them with new strength, and renders them more cautious. This grace commences salvation, promotes it, and perfects and consummates it. I confess that the mind of [*animalis*] a natural and carnal man is obscure and dark, that his affections are corrupt and inordinate, that his will is stubborn and disobedient, and that the man himself is dead in sins. And I add to this—that teacher obtains my highest approbation who ascribes as much as possible to divine grace, provided he so pleads the cause of grace as not to inflict an injury on the justice of God, and not to take away *the free-will to that which is evil.*

How the Holy Spirit operates upon the soul to effect its regeneration we cannot tell. In the nature of the case it is an insoluble mystery. Solomon says: "As thou knowest not what is the way of the Spirit, nor how the bones do grow in the womb of her that is with child: even so thou knowest not the works of God who maketh all." (Eccl. xi. 5.) With his eye perhaps on this passage our Lord said to Nicodemus, in referring to this mysterious subject: "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit." (John iii. 8.)

Perhaps there is something analogous in the mystery of inspiration, which is not rationalistic on the one hand, nor mechanical on the other, but dynamic, the Holy Spirit operating upon a spiritual nature which responds to his influences and willingly co-operates with them.

Some speak of a physical change wrought upon the soul in

regeneration, as if the substance of it were changed, or some new faculties were created. But there seems to be no warrant for this either in Scripture or in experience. Such expressions, when used by our poets, must be interpreted as the high-wrought language of poetry.

Dr. Dwight well says: "What the precise nature of the agency of the Holy Ghost, in regenerating mankind, is, in the metaphysical sense, man cannot know." That the Holy Spirit operates by the instrumentality of the word and sacraments—the

means of grace—the Scriptures assure us. (James i. 18; 1 Pet. i. 22, 23.) But it does not follow from this that he cannot and does not operate directly and independently upon the soul. He certainly does come in immediate, personal contact with every human spirit, wooing and striving with every man to bring him to Christ, and restoring every penitent believer to the forfeited image of Him who first created him. (John iii. 5, 6; Rom. viii. 1–17; 2 Cor. iii. 17, 18; Titus iii. 5, 6.)

§ 6. Synergism.

It does not follow from the foregoing that *monergism* is true, that man is passive in regeneration, that God does all the work, and man none at all. It is true man cannot do God's work in regeneration, but then God cannot do man's work in the process. There is necessarily a *synergism*,[4] the concurrent energy of God and man. Calvinists are obliged to admit this, though they contradict themselves when they make the admission. It is painful to see Dr. Dwight contending that the agency of the Divine Spirit in renewing the heart of man is not irresistible, since he was resisted by the Jews of whom Stephen speaks, and yet that he is never resisted by any whom he undertakes to regenerate! Dwight says (Vol. ii., p. 400, Sermon 72):

> I know of nothing in the regenerating agency of the same Spirit except the fact that it is never resisted, which proves it to be irresistible, any more than that which the Jews actually resisted. That the Spirit of God can do any thing with man, and constitute man any thing which he pleases, cannot be questioned. But that he will exert a regenerating agency on the human mind which man has not a natural power to resist, or which man could not

resist, if he would, is far from being satisfactorily evident to me. Indeed, I am ready to question whether this very language does not lead the mind to views concerning this subject which are radically erroneous.

In Ps. cx., in which we have an account of Christ's being constituted a priest forever after the order of Melchisedek, we have, in the third verse, this remarkable promise, made to Christ: "Thy people shall be willing in the day of thy power." This promise respects the very subject now under consideration, and is, I suspect, a more accurate account of it than can be found in the language which I am opposing. In the day of Christ's power his people *are* willing. The influence which he exerts on them by his Spirit is of such a nature that their wills, instead of attempting any resistance to it, coincide with it readily and cheerfully—without any force or constraint on his part, or any opposition on their own. That it is an

unresisted agency in all cases is unquestionable; that it is irresistible in any does not appear.

It is almost incredible that so great a man as Dr. Dwight should so contradict himself, Scripture, and experience. If "the Spirit of God can do any thing with man which he pleases," and if he wants all men to be regenerated that they might be saved, why does he not make all men willing as well as some men? If his agency is unresisted in all cases, to all intents and purposes it is irresistible. Hear him again:

No volition is ever excited but by good; and by good actually perceived and relished. As spiritual good is never thus perceived by a sinner, it will not excite a single volition in his mind toward the attainment of it, but will operate upon him as little as harmony upon the deaf, or beautiful colors upon the blind.

But the relish for spiritual good is the characteristic distinction of holy beings—their essential characteristic, without which they would cease to be holy. The want of it, on the contrary, is a primary characteristic of sinful beings. In this lies the real difficulty of regenerating ourselves, and not in the want of sufficient natural powers; and, so long as this continues, an extraneous agency must be absolutely necessary for our regeneration.

He was too good a logician not to see that this infers "partiality in the conduct of God." This he admits, but meets the objection with the stereotyped sophism that God should not be expected to make all men alike! Who ever thought that he should? But who, with the common sentiments of justice and humanity, would not expect him to furnish every fallen child of Adam sufficient assistance to enable him to choose life that he may live? To the objection that this doctrine supposes man not to be a free agent in

his regeneration, he brings nothing better than the pitiful sophism of Jonathan Edwards. He says:

It will not be pretended that all extraneous influence on the mind destroys its freedom. *We* act upon the minds of each other, and often with complete efficacy; yet it will not be said that we destroy each other's freedom of acting. God, for aught that appears, may act also on our minds, and with an influence which shall be decisive, and yet not destroy, or even lessen, our freedom.

Does the truth of the objection appear in the particular kind of agency here used? Let me ask the objector, what is this particular kind of agency? The only account of the subject in the Scriptures is that it is renovating, regenerating, or sanctifying. So far as my knowledge extends, neither the friends nor the adversaries of the doctrine have added any thing to this account which explains the subject any farther. But it can be said, even with plausibility, that God cannot sanctify an intelligent creature without infringing on his freedom. If it be said, it should also be proved; and this, so far as my knowledge extends, has not hitherto been done. Until it shall be done the mere assertion of our opponents may be fairly answered by a contrary assertion.

83

When God created man he created him in his own image. This, St. Paul informs us, consists in knowledge, righteousness, and true holiness. But if God, without destroying, or rather preventing, his freedom of agency, could create him in this image, it will be difficult to prove, or to conceive, that he cannot restore to his descendants the same image, after it has been lost, without destroying their freedom. The thing given is the same, and the agency by which it is given is the same. Its influence on the freedom of the creature must therefore be exactly the same. Its whole influence, in both cases alike, is successive to the agency itself—and must, of course, affect the freedom of the creature in precisely the same manner.

Does our experience furnish any knowledge of this nature? Ask any Christian, and he will tell you, if competent to answer the question, that he is conscious of no loss nor change in his own freedom of acting; but, on the contrary, he chose and acted in the same manner as before, and with the same full possession of all his powers; and that the only difference between his former and present state is, that he now loves God, and obeys him voluntarily; whereas he formerly hated him, and voluntarily disobeyed him.

The truth is, this objection is not derived from revelation nor from fact; it owes its existence only to the philosophical scheme of agency, which makes the freedom of moral beings consist in self-determination, indifference, and contingency—a scheme in its own nature impossible and self-contradictory, as any person may see completely evinced in an Inquiry concerning this subject by the first President Edwards.

Truly, every regenerate man is conscious that he acted freely in the whole process which resulted in his regeneration; and he is conscious of it because it was so! But if the Holy Spirit so operate upon the intellect and affections that the influence cannot be resisted, but must always "be decisive," there is no more moral and responsible freedom of action than there is in the fire that warms, or the river that flows, because it is the nature of each so to do. Let it be granted that without the influence of the Holy Spirit no man can put forth volitions which will lead to regeneration—this is that for which we contend—yet it does not follow that any man is by that influence deprived of the power of putting forth contrary volitions—call it "self-determination, indifference, contingency"—what you will. That, and that alone, is the reason why all men are not regenerated:

No, we would not, when we might.
Be freely saved by grace.

---

1. Because the word "prevent," in the sense in which it is used in our Authorized Version of the Bible, and in the Liturgy and Articles, is now generally used in the sense of "hinder," the Protestant Episcopal Church has changed it in this prayer to "Direct"—a most unhappy change! When some one proposed in the Conference to substitute "Assist" in our book, Dr. Coke rose up with great emotion, and said, "Never! I will go to the stake first. The brother can do with a little assistance, can he? Never!" So the change was not made, thank the Lord! We can condone the ignorance of one of the African Methodist Connections, which, thinking the word meant "hinder," actually inserted the word "wrong" thus; "Prevent us, O Lord, in all our *wrong* doings!" ↩
2. The fancied hendiadys making "water and Spirit" one and the same thing in John iii. 5, and "the Holy Ghost and fire" one and the same thing in Matt. iii. 11, so far as we now remember, originated with Calvin. A few Remonstrants indorsed it; but the Puritans claim it, and they are welcome to it. It is unexegetical, as we have shown in our "Commentary," and contrary to the interpretation of the great body of Biblical critics, ancient and modern, including John Goodwin, Wesley, Watson, and Bloomfield. Winer (Gram. Gr. Test., Sec. 66, par. 7) says: "Expositors have actually asserted the existence of this figure in the N. T.—*e. g.*, Matt. iii. 11; Acts xiv. 13; John i. 14

—but the list of examples alleged does not, when strictly examined, furnish one that is unquestionable." When, therefore, certain writers twit us with a belief in the Popish dogma of baptismal regeneration, because we very properly use John iii. 1–8 in the Baptism of Adults, they betray their ignorance, if not a worse quality. The Office of Baptism carefully discriminates between the sign and the thing signified; it does not confound them together nor put one in the place of the other: thus avoiding both errors, Puritan and Popish. Even Augustin saw the distinction, though through a glass darkly —"City of God," xiii. 7.↩

3. "Sermons," Vol. III., p. 379.↩
4. Synergism comes from *συνεργέω*, to co-operate or to work together with any one. The verb occurs five times in the New Testament—*e. g.*, Mark xvi. 20, "the Lord working with them." The cognate noun, *συνεργγός*, occurs thirteen times—*e. g.*, 1 Cor. iii. 9: "For we are workers together with God."↩

Chapter III.
Scripture Proofs of the Doctrine.

§ 1. Preliminary.

84
In proceeding to the Scripture proof of this article, it might be sufficient to state that the simple fact that God has made a revelation to men of his will and their duty, with tenders of divine help in its performance, promises of reward in case of obedience, and threatenings of punishment in case of disobedience, settles the question, without an array of particular passages. But though this is true, yet the doctrine in question may be more clearly illustrated and more firmly established by the latter course.

§ 2. Moses and the Prophets.

Moses sets the key-note in Deut. xxx. 15–20: “See, I have set before thee this day life and good, and death and evil. I call heaven and earth to record this day against you, that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing: therefore choose life, that both thou and thy seed may live: that thou mayest love the Lord thy God, and that thou mayest obey his voice, and that thou mayest cleave unto him,” etc. *Cf.* Jer. xxi. 8. So Ezekiel, in that wonderful expostulation of Jehovah with Israel in Ezek. xviii., closing with this pathetic language: “Repent, and turn yourselves from all your transgressions; so iniquity shall not be your ruin. Cast away from you all your transgressions, whereby ye have transgressed: and make you a new heart and a new spirit: for why will ye die, O house of Israel? For I have no pleasure in the death of him that dieth, saith the Lord God: wherefore turn yourselves, and live ye.” But did either God or the prophet suppose they could do this without divine aid? The very expostulation itself implies preventing grace; and sanctifying grace is promised to them in another place by this same prophet. Ezek. xxxvi. 25–28: “Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your

filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you. A

new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you: and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you a heart of flesh. And I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments, and do them." Here we have divine and human agencies, preventing and co-operating grace. So in Jer. xxxi. 33; *cf.* Heb. viii. 10; x. 15–17: "I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people." So Jer. xxxi. 18, 19: "Turn thou me, and I shall be turned; for thou art the Lord my God. Surely after that I was turned, I repented." What a striking case of co-operation is here!

The Psalter is full of examples of this sort. There is a remarkable passage in Ps. xxv. 8, 9; "Good and upright is the Lord; therefore will he teach sinners in the way. The meek will he guide in judgment; and the meek will he teach his way." That is, those who with docility yield to his gracious influence will be sure to be led into the way of life.

§ 3. John vi. 44–46, and Parallel Passages.

This corresponds with John vi. 44–46: "No man can come unto me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him; and I will raise him up at the last day. It is written in the prophets, And they shall be all taught of God. Every man therefore that hath heard, and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me." *Cf.* ver. 37: "All that the Father giveth me shall come to me; and him that cometh to me, I will in nowise cast out." The *giving* here is the same as the *drawing* in ver. 44, and implies willingness, docility, and concurrence on the part of those thus given or drawn. All who will consider their need of Jesus, note candidly the proofs of his Messiahship, and yield to the influence of preventing grace, will believe in him. The notion of necessitating grace forcing a certain elect number to come to Jesus, so that not one of them can fail to come, and no one besides can possibly come, is foreign from our Lord's argument, and absolutely contradictory of his repeated assertions; for in this discourse, as well as in the discourses which precede it, John iii.–v., and those which follow, John vii.–xii., he charges the guilt of unbelief upon

the prejudice and contumacy and sinister motives of the Jews; and threatens them with consequent

punishment—which, indeed, is the current teaching of the Scriptures. No one can be rewarded for doing what he cannot help doing, nor can any one be censured for not doing what is impossible. "*Shall* come to me" should be rendered "*will* come to me"—will believe upon me. No candid, earnest seeker of salvation can fail to find the Saviour; following his divine Guide, he will be sure to reach the goal. "Him that cometh to me" expresses volition, action, concurrence with divine grace: hence it is enforced as a duty, the neglect of which will incur punishment, and the performance of which will secure salvation. The drawing of the Father comprehends all that God does by preventing grace, miracles, preaching, etc., to bring men to Christ, and also their concurrent action: the divine cannot act without the human, nor the human without the divine. None can come to Christ without first being moved thereto, and enabled by grace; and none will be so conducted unless they use the grace thus given, since none are irresistibly dragged or forced to Christ, but *drawn*, which implies a voluntary yielding, as the "giving" to Christ implies their voluntary "coming" to him. As Augustin says, "It is impossible to believe without willing"—and the will cannot be forced. *Cf.* Jer. xxxi. 3; Hos. xi. 4. He says again, "Art thou not yet drawn? Pray that thou mayest be drawn." The thought, the sense of want, "the imperfect desire," are the beginning of this drawing, which God will follow up with "more grace," if we will use it, and then the result is certain. To "learn of the Father" implies application to what is taught; both are comprehended in the being taught by God, who cannot teach an unwilling soul. The consequent coming unto Christ implies such an act of volition as causes the soul to rest in Christ. This beautifully coincides with his invitation: "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me, for I am meek and lowly in heart; and ye shall find rest unto your souls. For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light." (Matt. xi. 28–30.) Christ is "meek and lowly in heart," as a divine teacher, that is to say, he is gentle and patient, not rigorous and overbearing, like the rabbis, in his instructions; and he wants us to be docile and pliable to his teaching. In the double use of the verb to learn—transitive and intransitive—he will

learn[1] us, if we will only *learn* of him—if we will "receive with meekness—docility—the ingrafted word, which is able to save our souls." (Jas. i. 21.) Thus the Saviour says, "If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God." (John vii. 17.) Here the verb "will" is not a sign of the future tense, but it denotes volition—"will to do"—not if any man should do it, but if any man is disposed to do it—resolves to comply with God's will. This is a rule of universal application. Every man who is resolved to do the will of God shall know what it is: he shall be drawn by the Father, and given to the Son; and in every stage of his course, from the first dawnings of preventing grace to his admission into heaven, he shall verify all Christ's teachings in his own consciousness. *Cf.* John iii. 21; v. 38–47; vi. 45; viii. 42, 47. That remarkable passage, Rev. iii. 20, perfectly agrees with the foregoing from the Gospel of John: "Behold, I stand at the door and knock: if any man hear my voice, and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me." The standing and knocking and calling and, coming in and feasting as a welcome guest sets forth preventing and co-operating grace; the hearing, the opening of the door, and feasting with the welcome guest sets forth the voluntary concurrence with preventing and co-operating grace, which, though indispensable and powerful, does no violence to the will.

§ 4. New Testament Examples.

Thus, when it is said the Lord opened the heart of Lydia, so that she attended unto the things which were spoken of Paul, it is clear from the record that while in one aspect of the case the Lord opened her heart, in another aspect she opened it herself; for she availed herself of the opportunity to hear the gospel, listened attentively to it, yielded with ingenuousness and docility to the gracious influence thus brought to bear upon her, and promptly espoused the cause of Christ.

Thus was it with Cornelius and his friends, Acts x. Thus was it with Saul of Tarsus, who responded to the divine call with a ready will and purpose to do as bidden: "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" And the experience of an awakened,

penitent sinner, which he so vividly portrays, is evidently that through which he himself passed. (Rom. vii.) There is co-operation with divine grace, beginning with the first glimmerings of spiritual life, passing through all the struggles of the soul against the bondage of sin and death, to the triumphant outburst, "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit: for the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death." (Rom. viii. 1, 2.) This ingenuous yielding to the influence of grace characterized the Bereans, who "were more noble than they of Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the Scriptures daily whether these things were so"—and it is suggestively and naturally added, "Therefore, many of them believed." (Acts xvii. 11, 12.) Thus was it in Antioch of Pisidia: "When the Jews saw the multitudes, they were filled with envy, and spake against those things which were spoken by Paul, contradicting and blaspheming. Then Paul and Barnabas waxed bold, and said, It was necessary that the word of God should first have been spoken to you; but, seeing ye put it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles. And when the Gentiles heard this, they were glad, and glorified the word of the Lord: and as many as were ordained to eternal life believed." (Acts xiii. 45–48.) The word improperly rendered "ordained"—τεταγμένοι—means disposed. They were disposed to enter into the way of life, and did not judge themselves unworthy of everlasting life, like the contumacious Jews, who put the word of God from them—and the result was, they believed. They received the grace of God, and not in vain, but yielded to it, and concurred with it, and thus were disposed to seek salvation—and saving faith followed, as a certain result. "He that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him." (Heb. xi. 6.) Thus the apostle says: "We are unto God a sweet savor of Christ, in them that are saved, and in them that perish: to the one we are the savor of death unto death; and to the other the savor of life unto life." (2 Cor. ii. 15, 16.) We preach the same gospel, with the same accompanying influence; some yield to it, and are saved, while others scorn the message, and do despite to the Spirit of grace, and are damned. *Cf.* Mark xvi. 15, 16;

2 Cor. vi. 1, 2. Thus he tells the Ephesians (Eph. ii. 8–10): “By grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast. For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them.” Salvation is, as here asserted, the gift of God; but then it is realized only through faith, which cannot indeed be exercised by us without preventing grace; but which, on the other hand, cannot be exercised for us by any other than ourselves. God cannot do the good works which he requires of us, and we cannot do them till we are created anew in Christ Jesus unto good works—*i. e.*, that we may be able to perform them. Peter sets forth the same synergistic doctrine: “Since ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth, through the Spirit, unto unfeigned love of the brethren, see that ye love one another with a pure heart, fervently; being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever.” (1 Pet. i. 22, 23.) They purified themselves, but it was through the Spirit; they were to love the brethren, but then they were to be born again in order that they might fulfill the injunction.

§ 5. Synergism Taught in the Scriptures.

This evangelical synergism is finely set forth in Phil. ii. 12, 13: “Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling; for it is God which worketh in you, both to will and to do of his good pleasure.” On this passage Bloomfield says:

> From these words, justly may we feel encouraged to work out our own salvation on the ground that herein divine power worketh *with* us (and *for* us), as it is said in Isa. xxvi. 12, “Thou hast wrought all our works *in* and *for* us,” for so I would there render, meaning in so far as to further our work. On the other hand, however, as justly may we feel *diffidence* in ourselves and humility toward God, when we consider that God it is who worketh *in* us, of his own sovereign *will* and *pleasure*, and that from him proceed both the will and the power to carry the will into *work* as regards our salvation. It is worthy of observation that even Calvin, in his annotation on the present portion, admits that *this* is no place in which to seek the doctrine of *gratia praeveniens*, nor, on the other hand, is it any suitable instrument by which to “beat down the doctrine of free-will.” Nay, even Augustin admits as much.

If this passage does not directly teach the doctrine of

preventing grace, because the language is addressed to Christians to stimulate and encourage them in the work of salvation, yet it

presupposes preventing, and directly inculcates co-operating, grace. Wesley, in his sermon on this passage, embraces both, and tersely says, "God works; therefore you *can* work: God works; therefore you *must* work"—that is, if you would be saved.

The same synergistic doctrine is inculcated in 2 Pet. i. 1–11, where Peter exhorts the believers to make their calling and election sure, by giving diligence in the development of all the Christian virtues. They were made partakers of a divine nature, and had given to them exceeding great and precious promises, and now they are called upon to add—ἐπιχορηγήσατε, supply—all that is necessary to constitute a perfect Christian character in the great contest to which they were called, and then God will have ministered unto them—ἐπιχορηγηθήσεται, supplied to them—all things necessary for their triumph at the end of their victorious conflict. *Cf.* Jude 19–25. Then there is that wonderful synergistic passage, Rom. viii. 26: "Likewise, the Spirit also helpeth our infirmities; for we know not what we should pray for as we ought; but the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered." The word rendered "helpeth" is συναντιλαμβάνεται, which means "to take hold in turn with any one," or "to lay hold along with:" hence to help, as in Luke x. 40, where Martha requests Jesus to bid Mary help her in her domestic work. The Holy Spirit helpeth us to bear our infirmities, or strengthens us against them, as our *Paraclete* in us, Christ being our *Paraclete* for us with the Father. We cannot employ the Holy Spirit as our proxy to do our praying for us, and, on the other hand, we cannot pray for ourselves without his assistance. Bloomfield says: "The apostle's words inculcate the great truth of the *absolute need of the Holy Spirit* to strengthen our will both to work and to pray as we ought; implying, of course, man's concurrence and co-operation with the heavenly aid." Thus the general sentiment conveyed is parallel to that in 1 Cor. xv. 10, "Yet not I, but the grace of God which was with me." And with this our exposition of the Eighth Article may well close.

"Now the God of peace, that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great Shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant, make you perfect in every good work to

do his will, working in you that which is well-pleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ, to whom be glory forever and ever. Amen."

---

1. So the rendering in the Liturgic Version of Ps. xxv. 4, 8: "Lead me forth in thy truth and *learn* me. Such as are gentle, them shall he learn his way."↩

Part III.

Article IX.
Of the Justification of Man.

91

We are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, by faith, and not for our own works or deservings: wherefore, that we are justified by faith only, is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort.

Introduction.

This is word for word the same as Article XI. of the Anglican Confession, except that that adds, "as more largely is expressed in the Homily of Justification." This Homily is not one of the Twenty-one Homilies contained in the Second Book of Homilies, composed by Jewel and others in the reign of Elizabeth, and appointed to be read in churches in the Thirty-fifth Article of the Anglican Confession; nor is it found by this name in the First Book of Homilies, composed by Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, and others, in the reign of Edward VI.; but one of them is styled the "Homily of Salvation," which is that called the "Homily of Justification."

This is the Homily cited by Mr. Wesley in his sermon on "The Almost Christian," and also in his sermon, "The Lord Our Righteousness," where there is this condensed quotation:

> Three things must necessarily go together in our justification: upon God's part, his great mercy and grace; upon Christ's part, the satisfaction of God's justice; and on our part, faith in the merits of Christ. So that the grace of God doth not shut out the righteousness of God in our justification, but only shutteth out the righteousness of man, as to deserving our justification. . . . That we are justified by faith alone, is spoken to take away clearly all merit of our works, and wholly to ascribe the merit and deserving of our justification to Christ only. Our justification comes freely of the mere mercy of God. For whereas all the world was not able to pay any part toward our ransom, it pleased him, without any of our deserving, to prepare for us Christ's body and blood, whereby our ransom might be paid, and his justice satisfied. Christ, therefore, is now the righteousness of all them that truly believe in him.

Speaking of the early Methodists in his sermon “On God’s Vineyard,” he says:

> The book which next to the Holy Scriptures was of the greatest use to them in settling their judgment as to the grand point of justification by faith was the book of Homilies. They were never clearly convinced that we are justified by faith alone till they carefully consulted these and compared them with the sacred writings, particularly St. Paul’s Epistle to the Romans.

It thus’ appears that the omission of the words, “as more largely expressed in the Homily of Justification,” was not on account of any objection to the Homily, but probably because it seems out of place in the Confession, especially as Mr. Wesley knew that few persons in America would have access to the Homilies.

The English Reformers in the reign of Henry VIII. embraced the Lutheran view of justification by faith, with some modifications. In the Articles of 1536, justification is defined as the remission of sins and acceptance into the favor of God. This is attained by the mercy and grace of the Father, freely for Jesus Christ’s sake, through contrition and faith joined with charity. This is repeated in the “Institution of a Christian Man.” But their doctrine crystallized into a more scriptural and Protestant form in the reign of Edward VI, as seen in the Homily of Salvation and Article XI. of the Confession of 1552, which reads thus: “Justification by only faith in Jesus Christ, in that sense as it is declared in the Homily of Justification, is a most certain and wholesome doctrine for Christian men.”

Chapter I.
Errors Concerning This Doctrine Stated and Refuted.

§ 1. Lutheran Views of the Doctrine.

93

Luther, as is well known, called justification by faith alone, *articulus stantis aut cadentis ecclesiae*—the article of a standing or a falling Church: with it the Church stands, without it the Church falls. He said truly that justification is by faith only, without holiness or good works, because of the merits of Christ, the sole instrument being faith: this faith will produce love and good works, but as justifying it is considered apart from every thing else. It would have been well if he had stopped at this; but he proceeded to say that the sins of the believer are imputed to Christ, and that Christ's righteousness is imputed to the believer; and he sometimes seems to identify assurance of personal salvation with justifying grace. This, with his hard speeches against the law, led to the Antinomian doctrine of imputed righteousness and cognate errors. Agricola is said to have pushed this to its logical consequences, that it matters not what may be a man's sins, if he be only clothed with Christ's righteousness. Luther himself earnestly opposed Agricola. Melancthon escaped all these errors. The Augsburg Confession (Art. IV.) teaches: "Men cannot be justified before God by their own strength, merits, or good works; but they are justified gratuitously for Christ's sake, through faith—when they believe they are received into favor, and their sins are remitted on account of Christ, who made satisfaction for our transgressions by his death. This faith God imputes to us as righteousness."

Melanchthon seems to have held that *fides formata*—faith perfected by love and good works—and not *fides informis*—a faith not thus informed and perfected by love, justifies the soul. And the later Lutherans seem to assign love and good works a part in justification. But one may very well maintain that faith is *formata*, as it "justifies pregnant with good works, but not as yet

94

having given birth to them." Thus the Augsburg Confession quotes

with approval the words of St. Ambrose, *Fides bonae voluntatis et justae actionis genetrix est*, "Faith is the mother of good volition and just action." This is a living, not a dead, faith, or bare, historical assent.[1]

§ 2. Patristic Statements.

95
It has been hotly contested that the Fathers held the forensic view of justification. The truth is that they were not uniform and consistent in their teaching on this subject. Some of them did hold this view; some held the opposite view; and some, again, seemed to vacillate between the two views. Thus Bishop Browne

96
cites a passage from Clement, of Rome, the earliest of the Fathers, which sets forth the forensic view very clearly. Speaking of faithful men of old, he says:

> They were all therefore greatly changed, not for their own sake, or for their own works, or for their righteousness that they themselves wrought; but through his will. And we also, being called by the same will in Christ Jesus, are not justified by ourselves, neither by our own wisdom or knowledge or piety, or any works which we did in holiness of heart, but by that faith by which God Almighty has justified all men from the beginning.

Here the word justify is used in the forensic sense, "to account righteous," as in our article, and not to make righteous, according to the Tridentine definition; and the instrument of justification is said to be faith, and nothing else. So that the quibble raised by Dr. Newman, that the phrase "in holiness of heart" means only "piously," does not affect the question. It is plain, as Waterland says, and as Faber admits, that justifying faith is opposed by Clement "to evangelical works, however exalted"—that is, as Faber expresses it, "works performed after the infusion of holiness into the heart by the gracious Spirit of God." According to Clement, justification neither makes us righteous, nor is effected by our righteousness. But as sanctification always takes place at the same time with justification, it is not to be wondered at that the Fathers sometimes spoke of justification as if it included the idea of making just as well as of accounting just. Thus Chrysostom, who sometimes

uses the word in a forensic sense, as in Rom. viii. 33: “It is God that justifieth”—“For when the judge’s sentence declares us just, and such a judge too, what signifieth the accuser?” Yet on Rom. iv. 7, “Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven,” he says the apostle “seems to be bringing a testimony beside his purpose; for it does not say. Blessed are they whose faith is reckoned for righteousness. But he does so purposely, not inadvertently, to show the greater excellence. For if he be blessed that by grace received forgiveness, much more he that is made just and that manifesteth faith.”

There is a similar ambiguity in Augustin. Thus on the language, “The doers of the law shall be justified,” he says, “What is to be justified but to be made just by Him who justifies the ungodly, so that from ungodly he becomes just?” He thus confounds that justification which turns upon the good works produced by faith with that initial justification which is solely by

faith. But he proposes to interpret it another way: “Shall be justified—as if it were said, shall be held and accounted righteous; just as it is said of a certain man, He is willing to justify himself—that is, to be held and esteemed just.”

Barrow well observes:

> The point having never been discussed, and those Fathers never having thoroughly considered the sense of St. Paul, might unawares take the word as it sounded in the Latin—especially the sense they affixed to it signifying a matter very true and certain in Christianity.

No great harm would result from this acceptation of the word “justify,” if it were not used by the apostle in the forensic sense—that is, for accounting righteous, pardoned; but great harm will result if it be held that none are pardoned till they are made holy, and that faith consequently stands for all the graces and virtues which it produces.

§ 3. Baptismal Justification.

Romish and some Anglican divines labor to show that the Fathers held to baptismal justification as well as baptismal regeneration. If justification be making just, then it is the same as regeneration, and the Fathers did sometimes identify regeneration

with baptism, or speak of the former as resulting from the latter. But we must take into consideration the inexact and rhetorical style of the Fathers, and bear in mind that they frequently speak of the sign as the thing signified, attributing to the former what they knew belonged to the latter. Indeed, this is sometimes done in the Scriptures, and that too in reference to baptism, as, for example, in Rom. vi. 3, 4, where it is said we are buried with Christ by baptism into his death. This form of speech is employed because baptism symbolizes the death unto sin and the new birth unto righteousness, and is a means and pledge of its accomplishment, though everybody knows that the Scriptures recognize faith as the great instrument and the Holy Spirit as the efficacious agent of its accomplishment. The clause in the Nicene Creed, "I believe in one baptism for the remission of sins," must be interpreted in the same way as Acts ii. 38: "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." So Mark i. 4: "John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission

of sins." But that John, as well as Peter, recognized faith as the instrument of pardon is clear from Acts xix. 4: "John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus." There can be no question that when an adult comes to baptism, the sacrament, being the exponent of faith, is a means whereby the end of faith may be secured. But it is absurd to say that the baptism justifies, because it has reference to justification; it is faith which justifies—not baptism, which is the exponent of faith. This is what the Scriptures mean; and the Fathers mean the same thing, or if they mean any thing else they are no more to be regarded than the modern asserters of baptismal justification and regeneration.

Bishop Browne says:

> If we take justification to mean remission of sins and admission into God's favor, it needs but very slight acquaintance with the writings of the early Christians to know, that as they confessed their faith "in one baptism for the remission of sins," so they universally taught that all persons duly receiving baptism, and not hindering the grace of God by unbelief and impenitence, obtained in baptism pardon for sin, admission into the Christian Church and covenant, and the assistance of the Holy Spirit of

God, and that so they were thenceforth children of God, members of Christ, and inheritors of the kingdom of heaven.

Now that penitents may receive justification in baptism is very clear, and that baptism may assist in the exercise of faith by which we are justified, is equally clear; but where one penitent receives justification in the act of baptism, it may be safely said that thousands receive it before baptism (like Cornelius and his friends), or after baptism (as in the case of persons baptized in infancy), or without baptism (as in the case of the thief on the cross, Quakers, and others, who never received the rite), while myriads are baptized (like Simon Magus) without even receiving justification or regeneration. It is out of the question, therefore, to talk about being justified by baptism.

§ 4. Views of the Schoolmen.

Bishop Browne thus epitomizes the views of the schoolmen:

The schoolmen generally understood justification to mean, not infusion of righteousness, but forgiveness of sins. It is true they looked on it as the immediate result of, and as inseparably connected with, grace infused; but their definitions made justification to mean, not the making righteous, but the declaring righteous. It is not to be supposed that they denied or doubted that such justification sprung primarily from the grace of God, and meritoriously from the death of Christ.

The faults charged upon their system are that they looked for merit *de congruo* and *de condigno*, that they attached efficacy to attrition, that they inculcated the doctrine of satisfaction, and that they assigned grace to the sacraments *ex opere operato*.

But this, including their notion that sanctification precedes justification, prepared the way for the anti-evangelical notion of justification set forth by the Council of Trent, and held by many High-church divines of the Anglican Church, as well as by the great mass of Romish divines. Indeed, some of the schoolmen held that justification did not merely result from sanctification, but also comprehended it. “Thomas Aquinas,” says Hagenbach, “understood by justification, not only the acquittal of the sinner from punishment, but also the communication of divine life (*infusio gratiae*) from the hand of God, which takes place at the same time.”

These views of the schoolmen were put into a definite form by the Council of Trent, and made the authoritative and exclusive doctrine of the Romish Church. Thus the Tridentine Fathers in their Canons of Justification, vii., viii., say:

Justification is not the mere remission of sins, but also the sanctification and renovation of the inward man through the voluntary reception of grace and gifts of grace; whereby an unjust man becomes just, the enemy a friend, so that he may be an heir according to the hope of eternal life. The only formal cause of justification is the justice of God, not that by which he himself is just, but that by which he makes us just—that, namely, by which we are gratuitously renewed by him in the spirits of our minds, and are not only *reputed*, but really *are* and are denominated just, receiving justice into ourselves each one according to his own measure, which the Holy Spirit imparts to each as he pleases, and also according to each one's own disposition and co-operation. When the Apostle asserts that man is justified by faith, and gratuitously, his language is to be understood in that sense which the constant agreement of the Catholic Church has affixed to it; in such a manner, namely, as that we are said to be justified by faith, because faith is the beginning of human salvation, the foundation and root of all justification, without which it is impossible to please God. (Heb. xi. 6.) And we are said to be justified gratuitously, because none of these things which precede justification, whether faith or works, merits the grace itself of justification.

This shows that by justification they mean making just: not only the remission of sins, but the sanctification of the soul. So in the anathematizing canons of the Council:

If any one shall say that the sinner is justified by faith alone, in the sense that nothing else is required which may co-operate toward the attainment of the grace of justification, and that the sinner does not need to be prepared and disposed by

the motion of his own will: let him be accursed. If any one shall say that men are justified either by the sole imputation of the righteousness of Christ, or by the sole remission of sin, to the exclusion of that grace and charity which is shed abroad in their hearts by the Holy Spirit, and which inheres in them, or shall say that the grace whereby we are justified is merely and only the favor of God: let him be accursed. If any one shall say that justifying faith is nothing but confidence in the divine mercy remitting sin on account of Christ, or that this faith is the sole thing by which we are justified: let him be accursed.

The Tridentine Fathers drew up these canons and curses with great adroitness. Under cover of denouncing the Antinomian errors that we are passive in justification, that our own will has nothing to do with it, and that we are justified by the sole imputation of the righteousness of Christ—meaning his personal holiness or obedience to the law—they repudiate the scriptural doctrine that we are justified—that is, pardoned—solely for the sake of Christ as the meritorious cause, and by faith, as the only condition or instrument by which it is realized. Faith, indeed, is not alone in justification, as there mast be penitence, prayer, and other means of grace, but it is alone in the act of justification—*sola*, though not *solitaria*.

According to the Council of Trent justification is not an act of God's free grace, by which, in view of our reliance on the propitiation of Christ, he pardons all our past sins; but it is a subjective process by which we are gradually made holy. Thus the Council teaches that those who are justified,

> By mortifying their fleshly members, and yielding them as instruments of righteousness unto sanctification, through the observance of the commands of God and the Church, their righteousness itself being accepted through the grace of Christ, and their faith co-operating with their good works, they grow and are justified more and more. This increase of justification the holy Church seeks when she prays: "Give unto us, O Lord, increase of faith, hope, and charity."

What is this but the process of sanctification? The Council, of course, denies that there is any assurance of justification.

> Although it is necessary to believe that no sin is, or ever has been remitted except gratuitously by the divine mercy on account of Christ, yet no one who affirms with confidence and certainty that his sins are remitted, and who rests in this confidence alone, is to be assured of remission.

If by this the Council merely intended to say that the assurance of remission does not consist in the confident assertion of it, it says right; but it is little to the purpose. None but the wildest Antinomian holds such a notion of assurance. But the Tridentine doctrine rules out assurance altogether, justification

being viewed as a process relating to the future, not an act relating to the past. Bossuet, in his "Variations of Protestantism," opposes the dogma of assurance, because, as held by Calvinists, it embraces the certainty of eternal salvation, final perseverance being one of the corollaries of absolute predestination. Well he might discard the

dogma thus distorted. Well might the Tridentine doctors discard it, if justification be a process of grace, a growth in holiness, never complete until we close our earthly career. We cannot know that we are justified till we are justified; and according to Trent we are not justified by any particular act of grace, but by a process indefinitely extended. It is not objective, but subjective, varying every hour according to our acts w exercises.

§ 6. Bellarmin's Development of the Tridentine Theory.

Bellarmin develops the Tridentine theory of justification by making it twofold: first, an infusion of an inherent principle of grace or charity, by which original sin is extinguished; and second, the good works resulting from it. The first justification is obtained by faith, the meritorious cause being the obedience and satisfaction of Christ. If he had right views of faith this statement, if made in regard to regeneration or sanctification, might pass unchallenged. But Bellarmin admits faith in regard to what he calls the first justification, only as *fides generalis*—a matter of the intellect and the first among many preparations for justification, according to the notion held by Aquinas of the "merit of congruity." This opens the door for the whole system of human merit as held by Rome.

§ 7. Merit Excluded.

There is no preparatory fitness for justification, considered as the pardon of past sin, except the use of preventing grace, which leads to the renouncing of sin and the acceptance of Christ as the only Saviour. It is absurd to speak of merit in this matter. There is no merit in a bankrupt merchant's ascertaining his insolvency and applying for the benefit of the act for insolvent debtors. That act, when its benefits are realized, does not make the insolvent debtor rich; it only discharges him from the obligation of his past indebtedness. When thus released he knows it, and is glad. He is now prepared for new business engagements. So the penitent sinner, renouncing all merit of his own,

being justified by faith, has peace with God through our Lord Jesus

Christ. He is at the same time admitted into the family of God; but this is not justification—it is adoption. He is also born again, renewed in the spirit of his mind; but this is not justification—it is regeneration, initial sanctification. (John i. 12, 13; Rom. vi. 1–4; viii. 1–4; 1 John i. 9; iii. 1–3.)

§ 8. Justifying Faith.

The faith by which this is realized is not merely "a conviction of the truth and reality of those things which God hath told us in the Bible," but it is over and above that, "a saving grace whereby we receive and rest upon Christ alone for salvation, as he is offered to us in the gospel." (Gal. ii. 16; Phil. iii. 9.) The intellect assents to this plan of salvation, the sensibilities are aroused and excited in favor of it, and the will gives its consent; thus the act of faith is accomplished, and justification is the instant result.

§ 9. Reconciliation of James with Paul.

The article well says, therefore, that we are justified, "not for our own works or deservings," but "by faith only." Nor is this contradicted by James ii. 24: "Ye see then how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only."

Voltaire and other infidels say that James and Paul contradict one another, and so they reject both. Luther rashly said that James contradicted Paul, and as Paul was right, James was wrong, and his Epistle "an epistle of straw"—that is, worthless.

Romanists and some Anglicans and others attempt to reconcile Paul with James, and not James with Paul. They say James speaks explicitly, Paul obscurely. Thus Bishop Bull says: "James explicitly asserts the doctrine of justification of sinful men before God by the works which proceed from faith in Christ; Paul simply denies that sinners can be justified by the works of obedience to the law of Moses, so that by faith he means the works which spring from faith in Christ." But what is this but justification by works? and justification, as Bull and his party teach, means the same thing in James as in Paul's Epistles to the Romans and Galatians. John Wesley seems to consider it only necessary to state Bull's theory in

order to its refutation: “I read over and partly transcribed Bishop Bull’s

‘Harmonica Apostolica.’ The position with which he sets out is this, that all good works, and not faith alone, are the necessary previous condition of justification, or the forgiveness of our sins. But in the middle of the treatise he asserts that faith alone is the condition of justification; ‘for faith,’ says he, ‘referred to justification, means all inward and external good works.’ In the latter end he affirms ‘that there are two justifications, and that only inward good works necessarily precede the former, but both inward and outward the latter.’” But, as has been often shown, Paul means by justification the pardon of sin; James uses the word in the sense of giving satisfactory proof that a professed believer is what he professes to be: the former is by faith, the latter by works. Paul, referring to the time when Abraham was justified, or accounted righteous, alludes to the period when, before his circumcision, he believed God, as it is recorded in Gen. xv. 5, 6: “And the Lord said unto him, So shall thy seed be; and he believed in the Lord; and he counted it to him for righteousness.” *Cf.* Rom. iv.; Gal. iii. But James refers to a different transaction, one which took place some forty years after: “Was not Abraham our father justified by works, when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar?” (James ii. 21.) Hence he adds: “Seest thou how faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect? And the scripture was fulfilled, which saith, Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness: and he was called the friend of God.” (Ver. 22, 23.) The offering of Isaac showed that his faith was not dead, but living and operative; the works which it produced demonstrated its vitality. Thus the statement as to his justification by faith in Gen. xv. is *fulfilled*—that is, the affirmation is established or confirmed by the works recorded in Gen. xxii. In a word, James affirms that when Abraham so signally obeyed God in offering Isaac—the child of that promise which he believed—he gave undeniable evidence that his faith was genuine, and that he had been justified by it; his works attested the vitality of his faith as they were the result of it. Instead of opposing this teaching of James, Paul corroborates it, when he says that the principle is of universal application, and will be recognized in the day of judgment: “For,” says he, “not the hearers of the law are just before God, but the doers of the law shall

be justified," and he says this a little before

his descant on justification by faith. (Rom. ii. 13.) Paul has as little use for a dead, inoperative faith, such as demons may have, as James himself, who describes such a vain and useless thing, and repudiates it. He had just as much use for justifying faith as Paul, because the faith which brings pardon brings good works in its train: it worketh by love and purifieth the heart. Thus while we are justified, that is, acquire pardon of sin, by faith, it is as the old divines say, by faith, which "is never alone, though it alone justifieth; it is not *solitaria*, although it is *sola* in this work." Thus it appears that there was no reason for Luther's rejection of the Epistle of James, as if it were opposed to the great fundamental Pauline doctrine of justification by faith alone, as there is a perfect harmony between the apostles.

The foregoing observations furnish a sufficient answer to those who say that faith of an historical or speculative kind—a mere assent of the mind to the fact that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God and the Saviour of the world—is all-sufficient for justification. To believe with the heart unto righteousness is to exercise that faith in Christ which engages the whole inward man properly signified by "heart"—namely, the intellect, the affections, and the will. It is needless to enter into any argument to show that such a faith is not dead, but living; not merely speculative, but practical; not inactive, but influential in the whole life.

§ 10. Mr. Wesley and the Conference of 1770.

The Calvinists made a great outcry against Mr. Wesley and the Conference of 1770, because they said that it is *false* that "a man is to do nothing in order to justification." "Whoever desires to find favor with God should 'cease from evil and learn to do well.' Whoever repents should do 'works meet for repentance.' And if this is not in order to find favor, what does he do them for? Is not this salvation by works? Not by the merit of works, but by works as a condition." On this language and the objection to it, Mr. Fletcher shows that it is agreeable to the Scriptures and to the homily on salvation, and continues:

If any still urge, "I do not love the word condition," I reply, it is no wonder, since thousands so hate the thing that they even choose to go to hell rather than perform it. But let an old worthy divine, approved by all but Crisp's disciples, tell you what we mean by condition. "An antecedent condition," says Mr. Flavel, in his "Discourse of Errors," "signifies no more than an act of ours, which, though it be neither perfect in any degree, nor in the least meritorious of the

benefits conferred, nor performed in our own natural strength, is yet, according to the constitution of the covenant, required of us, in order to the blessings consequent thereupon by virtue of the promise; and, consequently, benefits and mercies granted in this order are and must be suspended by the donor till it be performed." Such a condition we affirm faith to be, with all that faith necessarily implies. (See Watson's "Life of Wesley," Chap. XI., pp. 228–242.)

The Calvinists raised a great outcry against Wesley and the Conference for saying, "As to merit itself, of which we have been so dreadfully afraid: We are rewarded 'according to our works,' yea, 'because of our works.' How does this differ from 'for the sake of our works?' And how differs this from *secundum merito operum*, 'as our works deserve?' Can you split this hair? I doubt I cannot."

In the sense in which Wesley used the word merit, and referring it, not to our present justification or the pardon of sin, but to our final reward, he does not contradict himself nor the article on justification, nor the Scriptures, as Fletcher clearly shows. It is said in Matt. xvi. 27: "The Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, and reward every man according to his works." And Paul says, 1 Cor. iii. 11: " Every man shall receive his own reward according to his own labor." *Cf.* Ps. lxii. 12; Rom. ii. 6–11; 1 Cor. iv. 5; 2 Cor. v. 10; Gal. vi. 4–9; James ii. 24; Rev. ii. 23; xxii. 12. It is the uniform teaching of both reason and Scripture that the retributions of the future will be administered precisely in accordance with every man's character and conduct, whether it be good or bad. (Matt. xxv.)

Fletcher says:

If we detract from the word merit the idea of "obligation on God's part to bestow any thing upon creatures who have a thousand times forfeited their comforts and existence," if we take it in the sense we fix to it in a hundred cases—for instance this, "A master may reward his scholars according to the merit of their exercises, or he may not; for the merit of the best exercise can never bind him to bestow a premium for it, unless he has

promised it of his own accord"—if we take, I say, the word merit in this simple sense, it may be joined to the word good works, and bear an evangelical sense. To be convinced of it, candid reader, consider with Mr. Wesley that God accepts and rewards no work but so far as it proceeds from his own grace through the Beloved. Forget not that Christ's Spirit is the savor of each believer's salt, and that he puts excellence into the good works of his people, or else they could not be good. Remember, he is as much concerned in the good tempers, words, and actions of his living members as a tree is concerned in the sap, leaves, and fruit of the branches it bears. (John xv. 5.) Consider, I say, all this, and tell us whether it can reflect dishonor upon Christ and his grace to affirm that as his personal merit—the merit of his holy

life and painful death—"opens the kingdom of heaven to all believers," so the merit of those works which he enables his members to do will determine the peculiar degrees of glory graciously allotted to each of them.

As, however, the word merit in theology is generally used in the former sense, as in the article, where in the Latin recension it is repeated—"not for our own works or deservings"—*non propter opera et merita nostra*—it may be best not to use it in any other sense, so as to avoid ambiguity and misconception on this vital subject. Burnet says (Art. xii.):

The word merit has also a sound that is so daring, so little suitable to the humility of a creature, to be used toward a Being of infinite majesty that, though we do not deny but that a sense is given to it by many of the Church of Rome to which no just exception can be made, yet there seems to be somewhat too bold in it, especially when *condignity* is added to it; and since this may naturally give us an idea of buying and selling with God, and that there has been a great deal of this put in practice, it is certain that on many respects this word ought not to be made use of.

§ 11. The Conference of 1771.

But Wesley himself and his Conference at the next session, in Bristol, August 9, 1771, satisfied the Rev. Walter Shirley, the brother and chaplain of the Countess of Huntingdon—who with their friends had taken alarm at the positions in question—that they had no anti-evangelical meaning. They say:

Whereas, the doctrinal points in the Minutes of a Conference held in London, August 7, 1770, have been understood to favor "justification by

works," now the Rev. John Wesley and others assembled in Conference do declare that we had no such meaning; and that we abhor the doctrine of "justification by works" as a most perilous and abominable doctrine. And as the said Minutes are not sufficiently guarded in the way they are expressed, we hereby solemnly declare, in the sight of God, that we have no trust or confidence but in the alone merits of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, for justification or salvation, either in life, death, or the day of judgment. And though no one is a real Christian believer (and consequently cannot be saved) who doeth not good works, where there is time and opportunity, yet our works have no part in meeting or purchasing our justification, from first to last, either in whole or in part. Signed by the Rev. Mr. Wesley and fifty-three preachers.

It is to be noted that Mr. Shirley himself drew up the declaration, "and Mr. Wesley, after he had made some (not very material) alterations in it, readily consented to sign it, in which he was followed by fifty-three of the preachers in connection with him, there being only two that were against it."

One of these was Thomas Olivers, who refused to sign it because it seemed to oppose the doctrine of justification by works

at the day of judgment. But Wesley and his preachers signed the declaration as an irenic measure, and did not stumble at some expressions which otherwise might have been altered for the better. But the declaration does not contradict the Minutes any more than it contradicts James ii. 14–26, and other passages which favor "the second justification by works."

The merit spoken of in Wesley's Minutes has nothing to do with the scholastic and Romish merit either of congruity or condignity, as the justification by works has no reference to justification by faith, which, as has been seen, is simply the forgiveness of sins. So far as merit in the proper sense, meaning desert, is concerned, it is absurd to suppose that the creature, especially a poor, fallen, redeemed creature, like man, can deserve any thing from his Creator; for our Lord says, "When ye shall have done all those things which are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants: we have done that which was our duty to do." (Luke xvii. 10. *Cf.* Job xxii. 3; xxxv. 7; Ps. xvi. 2; Rom. vi. 23; xi. 35.) In this sense C. Wesley teaches us to sing:

> Freedom and grace and heaven to buy,
> My bleeding sacrifice expired.

We all are forgiven for Jesus' sake,
Our title to heaven, his merits we take.

But this is perfectly compatible with the doctrine of our second justification by works, and by the merit of these, in the sense explained by Fletcher and intended by Wesley. The twin doctrines are sharply set forth in the following lines by C. Wesley:

Close followed by their works they go,
Their Master's purchased joy to know;
Their works enhance the bliss prepared,
And each hath its distinct reward.

Yet glorified by grace alone
They cast their crowns before the throne;
And fill the echoing courts above
With praises of redeeming love.

§ 12. Universality.

Those who believe in the universality of the atonement of course believe in the universality of justification, that is, as Knapp explains it, "all must be able to obtain the actual forgiveness of their sins and blessedness on account of the atonement of Christ." He says justification is universal in respect to the persons to be pardoned, and in respect to sins and the punishment

of sin. He very properly explains the first thus: "All men may partake of this benefit; it was designed for all. (Rom. iii. 23; v. 15.) It is, however, bestowed conditionally. Those who do not comply with the conditions are not justified. It is not, therefore, universal in effect, and this solely through the fault of man." This is, as he says, opposed to Jewish exclusiveness and, it may be added, Calvinistic exclusiveness too, as well as to Universalist latitudinarianism, which makes it actually as well as provisionally universal. None are pardoned but believers.

The universality in respect to sins and the punishment of sin is shown in that all sins, without exception, are forgiven to those who comply with the prescribed conditions. (Ezek. xviii. 21, 22; Ps. ciii. 3; 2 Cor. vi. 11; Eph. ii. 5; 1 Tim. i. 15.) Dr. Knapp says, "The sin against the Holy Ghost cannot be considered an exception." In

respect to the punishment of sin he says:

Justification is *plena et perfecta*—full and perfect. The natural and physical evils which result from sin remain in this life, though modified and mitigated to those who are pardoned, as there is a cessation of the moral evils which result from sin. The positive punishments of sin are entirely removed, and there is the expectation of positive divine rewards, and the full enjoyment of them in the life to come.

§ 13. Terminism.

This universality refers also to what the Scriptures uniformly teach, that the possibility of forgiveness extends through the whole life of man.

And while the lamp holds out to burn,
The vilest sinner may return.

God has drawn no arbitrary line like that suggested in a popular hymn: "There is a time we know not when." While there is life there is hope, and may be pardon. It is true, however, that men may so habituate themselves to sin as to make it morally impossible for them to comply with the terms of forgiveness. (Jer. xiii. 23.) Hence it is madness to defer compliance to a future day and to the hour of death. But as justification is the pardon of sins that are past, and that pardon is conferred, not through the sinner's merit, but through the merit of Christ, we may still sing with Wesley:

Whene'er the wicked man
Turns from his sins to thee,
His late repentance is not vain,
He shall accepted be.

This question belongs to what is called the "Terministic controversy," on which Knapp says ("Christian Theology," p. 398):

The frequent perversion of the doctrine of justification gave rise, at the end of the seventeenth and commencement of the eighteenth century, to the terministic controversy. Joh. Ge. Böse, a deacon at Sorau, in endeavoring to avoid one extreme, fell into another. He held that God did not continue to forgive, even to the last, such persons as he foresaw would harden themselves in impenitence, but that he established a limit of grace (*terminum gratiae sive salutis peremptorium*), to which, and no further, he

would afford them grace for repentance. He appealed to the texts which speak of God as *hardening* or *rejecting* men, some of which have no reference to conversion and forgiveness, and some of which are erroneously explained by him. Ad. Rechenberg, at Leipsic, and others, assented to this opinion, though with the best intentions. But Ittig, Fecht, Neumann, and many others, opposed this opinion, and wrote against the work of Böse, "*Terminus peremptorius salutis humanae*," and against Rechenberg. They were in the right. This opinion is not taught in the Holy Scriptures, and is calculated to lead the doubting and anxious to *despair*, and to place them, as many sorrowful examples teach, in the most perilous condition, both as to soul and body, especially on the bed of death.

The doctrine that repentance and holiness are the *meritorious ground* of salvation would have equally terrible consequences. According to this doctrine we should be compelled to deny all hope of salvation to one who had lived an impenitent sinner till the last part of his life—which the Bible never does, and which is in itself cruel. The conscience even of the good man must say to him on his deathbed that his imperfect virtues are insufficient to merit heaven. In neither of these instances, then, would there be any consolation; but despair would be the result of this doctrine in both.

Dr. Knapp is right in this view, which is also held by Mr. Watson. In his sermon on Luke xix. 42 he says:

When men willfully hide their eyes from the things which belong to their peace, there comes a twofold judicial hiding from them on the part of God. The first is partial and temporary. . . . But the second case of judicial hiding is final and eternal. I do not think that this takes place before death; at least I see no scriptural authority for such an opinion; and no man, therefore, has the right to say so. (Sermons, Vol. ii., pp. 212, 213.)[2]

§ 14. Apostates Answerable for All Their Sins.

Knapp will not say that though apostates forfeit their justification

and consequent blessings, and are punished more severely than other sinners, they are chargeable with the sins of which they were formerly pardoned. He says there is no reason why they should be so imputed, and such is not the case in human courts. The texts he cites will not bear him out, namely, those which speak of sins being blotted out, and no more remembered, as Ezek. xviii. 22; xxxiii. 16; Ps. ciii. 11, 12; and those that say the gifts and calling of God are without repentance—that is, God will not recall the gifts he has

bestowed—Rom. xi. 29: a text which can have no bearing on the subject, as may be seen by the context. The passages cited from Psalms and Ezekiel refer to penitent pardoned sinners, and obviously mean that as such their sins shall no more be remembered, that is, they shall not be punished for them. But if they apostatize they forfeit their justification, which is the non-punishment of sin, just as the good works performed before their apostasy "shall not be remembered." (Ezek. xxxiii. 13.) This is inculcated by our Lord's parable of the merciless servant, Matt. xviii. 23–35. His ten-thousand-talent debt had been forgiven, but because of his cruelty to a fellow-servant the act of forgiveness was canceled. "And his lord was wroth, and delivered him to the tormentors till he should pay all that was due unto him." Jesus himself applies the parable: "So likewise shall my heavenly Father do also unto you, if ye from your hearts forgive not every one his brother their trespasses."

Bengel says:

His sins [though forgiven, ver. 27] are again reckoned to him on the ground of the inexhaustible claim of God upon his servants.

Whitby:

The doctrinal observation, which truly seems to be inferable from this text, is this: that sins once forgiven may, by our forfeiture of that pardon by our misdemeanors, be again charged upon us; for after this lord had forgiven his servant the whole debt (ver. 27), he being angry with him for his unmerciful deportment toward his fellow-servant, delivers him to the tormentors till he should pay all that was due to him (ver. 34); and then it follows, So likewise will my heavenly Father do to you (ver. 35). The conclusion from this place, saith Dr. Hammond, is this: that God's pardons in this life are not absolute, but according to the petitions of the Lord's Prayer, answereth to our dealings with others, and so conditional, and are no longer likely to be continued to us than we perform the condition.

Wesley:

His pardon was retracted, the whole debt required, and the offender delivered

to the tormentors forever. And shall we still say, But when we are once freely and fully forgiven, our pardon can never be retracted? Verily, verily, I say unto you, so likewise will my heavenly Father do to you, if ye from your hearts forgive not every one his brother their trespasses.

Whedon:

The king imprisons him for the debt which he had at first forgiven. The old forgiven sin of the apostate sinner springs up anew and condemns him. A man is finally punished for all the sins of his life. It helps him not one jot that at one time he was pardoned, but rather aggravates his case.

Pitiful is the subterfuge that no such case as this ever occurs in "the kingdom of heaven, as God molds the hearts and wills of all whom he pardons into a temper and disposition resembling his own." (Webster and Wilkinson.) If this means any thing to the purpose, it means that one who is pardoned can never sin again. Peter was mistaken when he said that certain apostates had forgotten that they were purged from their old sins, and that the latter end is worse with them than the beginning. (2 Pet. i. 9; ii. 20–22.) Ezekiel too was grossly mistaken when he says repeatedly and solemnly, or rather God by him: "When the righteous turneth away from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity—shall he live? All his righteousness that he hath done shall not be mentioned; in his trespass that he hath trespassed, and in his sin that he hath sinned, in them shall he die."

§ 15. Conclusion.

Thus this doctrine of justification by faith is "a most wholesome doctrine"—*saluberrima*—guarded at every point, from all Pharisaic and Antinomian errors, "and very full of comfort"—*ac consolationis plenissima*—as it assures to every penitent believer in Christ, who perseveres to the end, peace with God in the present world, and a glorious reward in the world to come.

---

1. In Dr. Friedrich Ueberweg's "History of Philosophy" (Vol. I., p. 267) occurs the following remarkable statement bearing immediately on the distinction made in the text: "The Pauline doctrine of the relation between faith and love was of a nature calculated powerfully to stimulate thought, with reference to the question as to the bond connecting these two elements of the religious life. If love or a morally perfect will is logically involved in the conception of faith (as may be inferred from Gal. iii. 26; v. 6; Rom. vi. 3 *seq.*; viii. 1 *seq.*; 1 Cor. xiii. 3), and if, therefore, the justification which is by faith means the divine recognition of an essential righteousness

contained in it (*i. e.*, in other words, if the divine justifying sentence —to follow, as may be and has been done, the Kantian terminology —is an '*analytical judgment* respecting the subjective moral quality of the believer'), then, on the one hand, the necessary connection of essential moral goodness with the historic and dogmatic elements involved in faith in Jesus as the Messiah and the Son of God is not demonstrated, and, on the other, we seem rather to be led to the non-Pauline sequence of faith, beginning of regeneration and sanctification, and relative justification in proportion to the degree of sanctification already attained, than to the Pauline one of faith, justification, and sanctification. But if, on the contrary, faith does not necessarily involve love (as may appear from Rom. iv. 19; x. 9, etc.), and enters only as a new statutory element, a Christian substitute for Jewish offerings and ceremonies (*i. e.*, if God's justification of believers is only a *synthetic judgment*, an imputation of another's righteousness), then the improvement of the will and life remains indeed a thing required, but no longer appears as a necessary consequence of faith, and the moral advantage possessed by him who believes in the real death and resurrection of Christ, and considers himself redeemed from guilt and punishment by the merit of Christ, over those who are not of the same faith, can only be arbitrarily asserted, since it is by no means verified in all instances by the facts of experience. It follows, also, in case the believing sinner, to whom righteousness has been imputed, fails to advance to real righteousness, that the divine justification of the morally unimproved believer, together with the condemnation of others, must appear arbitrary, partisan, and unjust, and unrestricted liberty is left to men for the frivolous misuse of forgiving grace as a license to sin." Without denying that this highly suggestive passage of Ueberweg's propounds a problem demanding exhaustive critical investigation of the exact forms of teaching set forth in the Pauline Epistles, and a penetrating insight into, and a close sympathy with, the system of evangelical Christianity, for its satisfactory and final solution, a few observations may be offered here upon the dilemma proposed. (1) It may be allowed that "love or a morally perfect will is logically involved in the very conception of faith," without accepting Ueberweg's inference that "the divine recognition of an essential righteousness" is the ground of justification from offenses that are past. Ueberweg's view is here too exclusively personal and subjective. It is certainly true that genuine contrition for sin involves, (a) renunciation and abandonment of it; (b) the God-fearing spirit, or the recognition of Deity as the one offended by sin, and an effort at propitiation by prayer and abasement; and (c) resohitions and promises of amendment. Consequently "in every

nation, he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted with him." (Acts x. 35.) The prayers and alms of Cornelius came up for a memorial before God. (Acts x. 4.) So far we have a description of the personal or subjective state which, in a sinner, is acceptable with God; and so far we have a diagnosis of the case equally true for one who has the knowledge of Christ and for one who is in ignorance of him and his salvation. God does not require the impossible, and, therefore, the sinner, destitute of the light of positive revelation and of the knowledge of his Saviour, but possessing this attitude toward his sins and leading this life, is graciously accepted without explicit reliance on the unknown Christ for salvation. But of one having the knowledge of Christ more is demanded. We pass now beyond the limits of the personal and subjective, and the sinner must believe the record which God has given us of his Son. By faith he must accept Jesus Christ as the propitiation for his sins, and the sacrifice of Christ, instrumentally appropriated by faith, and by faith only, is the ground of his justification. The subjective renunciation of sin and a perfect will to all goodness are, in the nature of things, preliminary to the exercise of saving faith, though it is the faith only which justifies. If the sinner stop short of this he is not saved. When Paul speaks, in Gal. v. 6, of "faith which worketh by love" (πίστις δι'ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένη), he is, by common consent, talking to backsliders. Paul, in 1 Cor. xiii., clearly discriminates between faith and love. The former is the initial and the latter the continuous or abiding Christian virtue, though without the cessation of the former. To the exercise of such a living, loving faith Paul was exhorting the Galatians. If an historical knowledge of Christ as the propitiation for sins and as the Mediator is then necessary for the knowledge of pardon, the love of Christ also constrains us and leads to a higher and more consistent life of morality and holiness. (2) Ueberweg concedes that the Pauline *ordo salutis* is faith, justification, sanctification; not regeneration, faith, justification, as the Calvinists teach. (3) This leads us at once to notice that the second alternative of his dilemma lies most heavily against the mechanical imputative theory of Calvinism. Faith, according to Paul and our Arminian system, does not secure "an imputation of another's righteousness:" this would be, indeed, to regard faith as a "new statutory element," and to make justification a "synthetic judgment," arbitrarily annexing to us a fictitious righteousness having no possible connection with our moral personality. Faith, on the contrary, appropriates, as a vicarious satisfaction for sin, the death of a divinely provided and divinely accepted victim. And the possessor of this faith cannot "fail to advance to real righteousness."—T.↩

2. For a more elaborate discussion of this doctrine see an article entitled “Terminism,” by Dr. Summers, in the *Southern Methodist Quarterly Review* for April, 1880, pp. 307–316. A chief text greatly relied upon by terminists is Hosea iv. 17: “Ephraim is joined to idols: let him alone.” Upon this text that sound exegete, Dr. Cowles, comments as follows: “‘Let him alone,’ cannot, in this connection, be the declaration of God’s purpose to abandon Ephraim and withdraw his spirit, as has been supposed by some; but is God’s command to Judah to desist from all society with Ephraim, and leave him to sin and suffer alone. The general course of thought in the context, as well as the phrase itself, requires the latter construction.” See Dr. Summers’s exposition of this and other scriptures in his article.—T. ↩

Chapter II.
Catholic and Evangelical Character of This Doctrine.

112

This article corresponds with the Tenth Article of the Creed, and the fifth petition of the Lord's Prayer; and they mutually explain each other.

§ 1. Priestly Pardons.

When we say in the Creed, "I believe in the forgiveness of sins," we do not mean that the priest forgives sins. Indeed, there is no priest in the New Testament Church except the great High-priest of our profession, and as all believers are kings and priests to God. The word *priest*, even as an abridgment of *presbyter*, is never used for the elder, or bishop, as a minister of the Church, in the New Testament; while ἱερεύς, which means one who offers sacrifice and performs other sacerdotal rites, is never used to designate a minister of the Church, not even an apostle. Where, then, there are no priests there can be no priestly pardons. But it is replied that our Lord said to the apostles, "Whosesoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosesoever sins ye retain, they are retained." True, he did so address the apostles. Here is the entire passage; it occurs in the narrative of our Lord's appearance to the apostles on the evening of the day on which he rose from the dead, John xx. 21–23: "Then said Jesus unto them, Peace be unto you: as my Father hath sent me, even so I send you. And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whosesoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosesoever sins ye retain, they are retained." This breathing on them, with the language accompanying it, was a guarantee and perhaps a foretaste of the endowment from on high, which took place on the Day of Pentecost, and which qualified them for their office and work as apostles, as the infallible and authorized representatives of their Lord in establishing his kingdom and setting forth its constitution and laws. What they set forth on earth, as the conditions of the forgiveness of sins, was confirmed in

heaven, because they acted under the plenary influences of the Holy Spirit. By consulting the Acts and Epistles of the apostles we may see what those conditions are, namely, “Repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ.” (Acts xx. 21.) “Being justified by faith, we have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ.” (Rom. v. 1.) “Be it known unto you therefore, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins: and by him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses.” (Acts xiii. 38,39.) “In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins according to the riches of his grace.” (Eph. i. 7.) This is in precise accordance with our Lord’s reiterated statements. (John iii.; vi.; Mark xvi. 16; Luke xxiv. 46, 47.) The New Testament is full of this doctrine. But there is not a single line of Holy Writ which intimates any thing about “the tribunal of penance,” “auricular confession,” “sacerdotal absolution,” “penitential satisfaction for sins,” and the like: not a syllable.

That the inspired apostles, who had the *charism*, or miraculous endowment, of discerning spirits, could in special cases pronounce infallibly concerning the reality of a man’s faith, and consequent forgiveness, is true, and this may be embraced in the prerogative in question. But what priest, prelate, or pope, has that endowment?

We admit that God “hath given power and commandment to his ministers to declare and pronounce to his people, being penitent, the absolution and remission of their sins,” so that they can say, as in the form of absolution in the English Liturgy, “He pardoneth and absolveth all them that truly repent, and unfeignedly believe his holy gospel.” But we regret that the rubric reads: “The Absolution or Remission of sins to be pronounced *by the priest alone*, standing; the people still kneeling.” The punctuation—copied from the edition of 1662, which is considered authentic—which has the comma after the word “alone,” shows that it does not merely qualify the word “standing”—the posture of the minister, the people kneeling—but that it restricts its pronunciation to the priest—none others, not even a deacon being allowed to pronounce the awful, sacerdotal words. Accordingly, on “The Ordering of Priests,” the Bishop is instructed to say, “Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work

of a priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands. Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained."

We are aware that the Evangelical party in the Church of England interpret this formula in a non-popish sense; but the High-church party have always contended that it means, and was intended to mean, that by the act of ordination, the functionary is made a priest—not merely a πρεσβύτερος but a ἱερεύς, having the sacerdotal prerogative of absolving penitents, as claimed by the priests of Rome. The best that can be said for this use of the words in question is said by Bloomfield in his note on John xx. 23:

> In these words our Lord formally confers on his apostles—and through them on the ministers of the gospel in every age—authority to certify those who should *embrace* the offer of the gospel that their sins were forgiven them, and to declare to those who should *reject* that offer that they were still under the guilt and condemnation of sin. Though intended principally for the *apostles*, yet it must be meant to be extended to those who should *succeed* them in carrying on the same holy work. In the full belief that the authority here given was not, as some say, limited by our Lord to the first ministers of the gospel, but that it belongs to those who are duly appointed to the same ministry, even unto the end of the world (Matt. xxviii. 20), the Church of England, in the Form for the Ordination of Priests, uses the form of words recorded in this and the preceding verse as having been used by our Lord for the purpose; so that those who are thus lawfully appointed are fully authorized to *pronounce* (for the terms ἀφῆτε and κρατῆτε are to be taken *declaratively*) forgiveness of sins, or the contrary.[1] I agree with.

115

Mr. Alford, that "the gift belongs to those who are lawfully sent to minister in the churches; not, however, by successive *delegation* from the apostles—of which there is, in the New Testament at least no trace—but by their mission from Christ, the Bestower of the Spirit for their office, when *orderly* and *legitimately* conferred upon them by the various churches."

That is liberal—coming from learned Anglican ministers. It pleases us to see them thus unequivocally repudiate the Apostolical succession—so called. All ministers who have a divine call to their work in "the various Churches"—Episcopal, Presbyterian, Congregational, or others—have the authority to pronounce this absolution. But may not every Christian, lay or clerical, male or female, do the like—though not in an official capacity? Will the words fail of their effect when pronounced by a layman to a poor penitent sinner inquiring the way of salvation? We trust not; and

the experience of thousands confirms our verdict.

But if the compilers of the Liturgy are to be allowed to explain their own language, we fear a less evangelical meaning is to be attached to it than Bloomfield and Alford suppose. In "the Order for the Visitation of the Sick," we find the following Rubric and Form of Absolution:

> Then shall the sick person be moved to make a special confession of his sins, if he feels his conscience troubled with any weighty matter. After which confession, the priest shall absolve him (if he humbly and heartily desire it) after this sort: "Our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath left power to his Church to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in him, of his great mercy forgive thee thine offenses; and by his authority committed to me, I absolve thee from all thy sins, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen."

Wheatly and others consider this absolution *judicial* only in regard to "ecclesiastical censures and bonds," and say, "It looks as if the Church did only intend their remission," as the succeeding collect prays for the pardon and forgiveness of sins committed directly against God. "As to the pardon of God, and applying it directly to the sinner's conscience," says Wheatley, "the power of the priest is only *ministerial*." Why then was not this distinction stated in the rubric, the absolution, or the collect? Wheatly's exposition of this subject is learned, labored, self-contradictory, and unsatisfactory. The revisers of the Prayer Book for the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States *did well* to omit this absolution, and those who wish it restored *mean ill*. They want the Romish confessional smuggled into a

so-called Protestant Church—a title, by the way, which they cordially detest, though it is their legal designation.

As the article on the forgiveness of sins follows that on the Church, some say that this remission is received in the Church first by baptism, and afterward by repentance. But we have elsewhere discussed this question.[2]

§ 2. The Creed and the Lord's Prayer.

The forgiveness of sins which we profess in the Creed is the justification which is confessed in this article. "Who can forgive sins

but God only?" If "the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins," it is because he is God as well as man. (Mark ii. 3–12.) "I, even I, says Jehovah, am he that blotteth out thy transgressions for mine own sake, and will not remember thy sins." (Isa. xliii. 25.) "It is God that justifieth." (Rom. viii. 33.) On what terms and by what instrumentality he does this, we have already seen and the article explicitly states.

This, as we have intimated, agrees precisely with the fifth petition of the Lord's Prayer: "Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us." In Matt. vi. the word is "debts;" in Luke xi., the word is "sins"—meaning the same. The word trespasses expresses the idea, and is used by our Lord in his paraphrase on this petition: "For if ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you; but if ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses." (Matt. vi. 14, 15.) "Trespasses" is common in old English versions of the Lord's Prayer—thus Tyndale: "And forgeve us oure treaspases, even as we forgeve our trespacers"—in Luke, "every man that treaspaseth us." As obedience is due to God, by failing to do our duty we become indebted to his justice, which demands the execution of the penalty of the law; by forgiveness that obligation is discharged. "As we forgive those who trespass against us," is the same as in Matthew, "as we forgive our debtors," and in Luke, "for we also forgive every one that is indebted to us." The language denotes similitude—like as we also forgive. It does not imply that our act of

forgiveness is as perfect as God's; but it rather recognizes his grace in enabling us to forgive our debtors; his forgiving love is exemplary to us, not ours to him; while it is implied that we shall not secure it if we do not imitate it. *Cf.* Eph. iv. 32; v. 2. This rule applies to the initial act of pardon, and also to its repetition, or the perpetuation of pardon when once granted.

Preventing grace is sufficient to enable a penitent to bring forth this as one of the fruits meet for repentance; and no one ever received pardon from God who was not willing to pardon every one who had trespassed against him. That those who have been forgiven and will not forgive others will forfeit their forgiveness is evident from the nature of the case, and from the explicit statement of our Lord, as illustrated in the case of the unforgiving servant in Matt.

xviii.: “Then his lord, after that he had called him, said unto him, O thou wicked servant, I forgave thee all that debt, because thou desiredst me: shouldest not thou also have had compassion on thy fellow-servant, even as I had pity on thee? And his lord was wroth, and delivered him to the tormentors, till he should pay all that was due unto him. So likewise shall my heavenly Father do also unto you, if ye from your hearts forgive not every one his brother their trespasses.”

§ 3. Pardon by Prerogative Considered.

As a creditor has the prerogative of canceling the obligation of a debtor without any consideration, some have hastily concluded that God has that prerogative, and exercises it toward sinners. Admitting that this would be possible if there were no other parties involved but God and the sinner, it cannot be the case in view of the relations which both sustain to the universe of moral and intelligent beings. So far as the sinner is concerned, pardon is entirely free, all of grace. But this does not preclude the necessity of a satisfaction to the perfections of God, which have been outraged by the sinner, and a safe guaranty to all the subjects of God’s moral government, the sinner himself included, that his pardon shall have no sinister bearing upon any principles involved in that government. This we have fully shown to be the case in our exposition of the Second Article; and this is explicitly stated in the article now under consideration: “We are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, by faith, and not for our own works and deservings.”

118

It is none the less, but all the more, of grace, because our pardon has been purchased by his merit; for “God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.” (John iii. 16.) “Being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time his righteousness: that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus.” (Rom. iii. 24–26.) “But there is

forgiveness with thee, that thou mayest be feared." (Ps. cxxx. 4.)

It is none the less, but all the more of grace, because it is vouchsafed on the condition of faith—as the apostle says, "Therefore it is of faith, that it might be of grace." (Rom. iv. 16.) Any one not prejudiced can see that faith is the necessary and the only instrument by which we receive the atonement, or reconciliation; and that in its very nature it excludes all idea of merit in the sinner, as it relies alone on the merit of the Saviour.

§ 4. The Calvinistic and Arminian Ordo Salutis.

Some Calvinistic divines who are clear enough in distinguishing between justification as a *relative* work, and regeneration as a *real* work, fall into a *hysteron proteron*, by reversing the order of their occurrence. All admit that they are in a general view synchronous, but in the order of thought justification necessarily precedes regeneration; but they put regeneration first. This is their order: Regeneration, faith, repentance, and finally justification. How palpably this contradicts the Scripture we need hardly stop to show. "Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the gospel of the kingdom, and saying, the time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye, and believe the gospel." (Mark i. 14.) "But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name." (John i. 12.) "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus." (Gal. iii. 26.) "But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness." (Rom. iv. 5.)

One would think that nothing can be plainer than this: Repentance precedes justifying faith. An impenitent sinner cannot

believe on Christ with the heart unto righteousness; he must renounce his sins (as well as his self-righteousness) before he can embrace his Saviour; he must be first justified as a sinner—a sinner, though a penitent sinner, not as a saint—for God justifieth the ungodly, but he justifies no unbeliever. We are justified by faith alone, and not for our own works or deservings: not in view of the sanctifying work of the Spirit, but in view of the redeeming work of the Son. Then being justified by faith we have peace with God, and

that faith worketh by love and purifieth the heart. The Spirit who works that faith in us with our concurrence, in the same way, and at the same time, creates us anew in Christ Jesus unto good works, as the apostle says, Eph. ii. 8, 9.

It is marvelous that any should mistake this divine method. We can account for it only in this way. Our Calvinistic brethren believe as we do, that all are born in sin, and of themselves are utterly incapable of performing any good thing apart from divine grace. "What!" they exclaim, "can a corpse perform the actions of a living man? Must not the dead sinner be raised to newness of life, before he can make a motion toward that which is good? Surely he must first be regenerated—and he cannot but be passive in regeneration —before he can believe or repent." They imagine that this puts us into an inextricable dilemma. But their fallacy is easily exposed. They forget that preventing grace is given to every man, and that grace which goes before man's effort (as its name implies) is given to him to enable him to comply with the conditions of salvation. If he cannot act until he is regenerated, and if as a dead man he must be passive in regeneration, how can it be his duty to be regenerated? how can repentance or faith be a duty? how can he be held responsible for the omission of any thing good, or for the commission of any thing evil? He cannot be censured for unbelief or impenitence, as he cannot repent or believe till he is regenerated, and he cannot regenerate himself, or do any thing toward his regeneration. Is there any flaw in this argument?

But if preventing grace be given to a man to enable him to repent and believe, he can be held responsible for his impenitence and unbelief. Repentance and faith in this case can be consistently required as the conditions of justification and regeneration, and there is nothing unreasonable or unjust in the sanctions by which repentance and faith are enforced. "Except ye

repent, ye shall perish." "He that believeth not shall be damned."

God alone regenerates the soul; but he will not regenerate any one whom he does not justify—and God alone justifieth; but he will not justify any one who does not renounce his sins by repentance, and embrace the Saviour by faith. We need hardly say that though no one can repent or believe without the aid of God's grace, yet God can neither repent nor believe for any man.

§ 5. Dr. Cocker's Erroneous View of Justification.

There is great unanimity among Protestants of what are called the Evangelical School, on the forensic use of the term justification and its cognates, as applied to this subject. We can call to mind but one Methodist who has written adversely to the view which we have defended in opposition to the Tridentine opinion. We were greatly surprised to find the following language used by Dr. Cocker in the number of the *Methodist Quarterly Review* for January, 1876:

> I am not unmindful of the fact that in Wesleyan theology we have been taught to render the Greek δικαιοσύνη exclusively by the word "forgiveness." Justification, we say, is "the pardon of sin." And here, I think, we are wrong. Justification—righteousness—is a generic term, embracing several specific terms, as pardon, adoption, and regeneration, or sanctification.
>
> Of course, to *justify* means to forgive sin, but it means more than this. It means to be "made free from sin," and to be constituted inherently and actually righteous. This is unmistakably the sense in which the term is used in Rom. vi. 6, 7: "Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the *body of sin might be destroyed*, that henceforth we should not serve sin. For he that is dead is *freed from sin*" literally, "is *justified from sin.*" So also in Rev. xxii. 11: "He that is unjust, let him be unjust still: and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still: and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still:" literally, "he that is *justified*, or *made just*, let him be just still."
>
> Many more passages might be given to show that the term justification is employed in so wide a sense as to embrace sanctification also. These are sufficient for our purpose. We claim that the *righteousness of God* (δικαιοσύνη γὰρ Θεοῦ, Rom. i. 17) expresses the whole economy, the whole method and process of human recovery or redemption; and that the phrase, *righteousness of faith* (δικαιοσύνη ἐκ πίστεως, Rom. v. 1–11), comprehends the totality and unity of Christian consciousness, from its first dawning light in the soul to its complete fruition in the eternal day.

We say that we read this with surprise and regret. We really thought that if any doctrine were well grounded among Protestants it was that of justification by faith. Luther showed his sense of the importance of this doctrine by calling it the Article

of a standing or a falling Church—that is, a Church stands or falls as it holds or rejects this doctrine. This may indeed be said of other fundamental dogmas; and the author of "Ecce Homo" applies the *gnome* to the aggressive, or missionary, feature of the Church. But

the language shows how highly the great Reformer held this doctrine. If it is of so great importance it surely should be maintained in all its orthodox simplicity and fullness.

We have shown that nothing can be more simple, explicit, and definite than the Ninth Article of our Confession.

In the next article it is stated that good works are "the fruit of faith, and follow after justification." The article says: "We are accounted righteous"—*not made righteous*—in justification. This is indeed "Wesleyan theology." Thus the Wesleyan Methodist Catechism: "Justification is an act of God's free grace, wherein he pardoneth all our sins, and accepteth us as righteous in his sight only for the sake of Christ." And it is there distinguished, as a *relative* work, from regeneration and sanctification, as a *real* work—justification being done *for* us, and the other being done *in* us. In justification we are *accounted, accepted*—dealt with—as if we were righteous, just as pardoned culprits, who are not by their pardon made innocent, are dealt with as if they were not criminals. Hence in the Scriptures justification, pardon, forgiveness, and remission of sins are used interchangeably as synonymous expressions, with slight variations of import, indeed, but all indicating the *relative* work—that done *for* us—which we have distinguished from the real —that done *in* us. Thus, when the publican's sins were forgiven, he is said to have been justified. (Luke xviii. 13, 14) So Acts xiii. 38, 39: "Through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins: and by him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses." This is explained and developed in that great classical text, Rom. iv. 5–8: "But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness. Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man, unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works, saying, Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin." Here, it may be observed, the word rendered "righteousness" is the noun corresponding to the verb rendered "justifieth." All

admit that the words δικαιοσύνη and δικαιόω are used in different senses in the New Testament. The noun occurs, we believe, ninety-two times, and is invariably rendered "righteousness." The verb occurs forty times, and is rendered "justify" thirty-eight times, once

"freed," and once "let be righteous." These two exceptions are found in the passages cited by Dr. Cocker: Rom. vi. 7; Rev. xxii. 11. Why did he not in the latter case—for the former proves nothing—quote the balancing clause: "He that is unjust, let him be unjust still: and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still: and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still: *and he that is holy, let him he holy still*"? Surely, he can find no support from this passage.

§ 6. John Goodwin on Justification.

That justification by faith is simply the remission of sins, and not, as the Antinomians teach, the imputation of Christ's righteousness, or, as the Romanists hold, inherent righteousness, is surely the doctrine of Paul, as set forth in the Epistle to the Romans, and is by no means a peculiar feature of "Wesleyan theology." It is most luminously, learnedly, and logically expounded and defended by the great Arminian Puritan, John Goodwin—in comparison with whom most divines seem to be dwarfs—in his immortal work, "The Banner of Justification." We know not where to begin or where to end in quoting from this treatise. But we will give a taste of it, by quoting Sec. x.: "How the Spirit of God is or may be said to justify men"—in which Goodwin cites this very passage, Rev. xxii. 11:

> Men are said in Scripture as well to be justified as sanctified by the Spirit of God, and this as justification is distinguished from sanctification. "But ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God." (1 Cor. vi. 11.) Some expositors, indeed, understand the word, εδικαιωθητε, ye were justified, not of justification, properly so called, or which standeth in remission of sins, but of such a justification which consisteth in a progress or proficiency in righteousness, or in the profession and practice of Christianity. For the justification of which exposition they plead the exigency of the order or gradation in the text itself, as also the like use or signification of the word in the Apocalypse, xxii. 11: Και ο δικαιος δικαιωθητε ετι, *Let him that is righteous*, or just, *be justified still*, that is, as the expositors we speak of interpret, "Let him increase and make forward in ways of righteousness." It must be acknowledged that to grow in grace and proceed in holiness and righteousness from day to day may be called a man's justification in a declarative or arguitive sense, namely, as they argue or declare a man to be a justified person, and his faith to be of the right kind, a living and growing faith; yea, they may be

termed a man's justification, as they are just matter of his approbation and commendation, which in many cases are used in a sense parallel to that of the word "justification," as it is used sometimes. But the justification which is the subject of our present discourse doth not consist in any action, one or more, nor in any quality, one or more; but rather in a state or condition, namely, such whereinto a person is translated or brought by the pardon of his sins, or sentence of absolution awarded by God. Nor need we take the word "justification," in the Scripture lately cited (1 Cor. vi. 11), in any other sense but this. For justification, in this sense, may be ascribed to the Holy Ghost, as he hath a special and appropriate hand in raising the work of faith by which men are thus justified, in the hearts of those who do believe; in which respect faith is registered by the Apostle Paul amongst the fruits of the Spirit (Gal. v. 22); and by his fellow-apostle Peter they who believe are said to "obey the truth," speaking of the obedience of faith to the gospel, "through the Spirit" (1 Pet. i. 22); and the Christians in Achaia are said to have "believed through grace" (Acts xviii. 27), that is, through the grace of God in his vouchsafement of his Spirit unto them, by whom they were enabled to believe; yea, and actually believed. Now, then, according to the known maxim or principle in reason, *quod est causa causae, est causa causati*, "That which is the cause of any cause producing an effect is the cause of the effect itself, as well as of the cause producing it;" faith being the cause or means of justification, and the Spirit the cause of faith, justification may as truly, and not much less properly, be attributed unto the Spirit as unto faith.

§ 7. John Calvin on Justification.

Calvin, in the eleventh chapter of the third Book of his "Institutes," in his sharp reply to Osiander, says:

Throughout this discussion the terms *righteousness* and *justify* are extended by him to two things. First, he understands that "to be justified" denotes not only to be reconciled to God by a free pardon, but also to be made righteous; and that righteousness is not a gratuitous imputation, but a sanctity and integrity inspired by the divine essence which resides in us. Secondly, he resolutely denies that Christ is our righteousness, as having, in the character of a priest, expiated our sins and appeased the Father on our behalf, but as being the eternal God and everlasting life. To prove the first assertion, that God justifies not only by pardoning, but also by regenerating, he inquires whether God leaves those whom he justifies in their natural state without any reformation of their manners. The answer is very easy; as Christ cannot be divided, so these two blessings, which we

receive together in him, are also inseparable. Whomsoever, therefore, God receives into his favor, he likewise gives them the Spirit of adoption, by whose power he renews them in his own image. But if the brightness of the sun be inseparable from his heat, shall we therefore say that the earth is warmed by his light, and illuminated by his heat? Nothing can be more apposite to the present subject than this similitude. The beams of the sun quicken and fertilize the earth, his rays brighten and illuminate it. Here is a mutual and indivisible connection. Yet reason itself prohibits us to transfer to one what is peculiar to the other. In this confusion of two blessings which Osiander obtrudes on us, there is a similar absurdity. For as God actually renews to the practice of righteousness those whom he gratuitously accepts as righteous, Osiander confounds that gift of regeneration

with this gracious acceptance, and contends that they are one and the same. But the scripture, though it connects them together, yet enumerates them distinctly, that the manifold grace of God may be the more evident to us. For that passage of Paul is not superfluous, that “Christ is made unto us righteousness and sanctification.” And whenever he argues, from the salvation procured for us, from the paternal love of God, and from the grace of Christ, that we are called to holiness and purity, he plainly indicates that it is one thing to be justified and another thing to be made new creatures. When Osiander appeals to the Scriptures he corrupts as many passages as he cites. The assertion of Paul, that “to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness,” is explained by Osiander to denote making a man righteous. With the same temerity he corrupts the whole of that fourth chapter to the Romans, and hesitates not to impose the same false gloss on the passage just cited, “Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God’s elect? It is God that justifieth;” where it is evident that the apostle is treating simply of accusation and absolution, and that his meaning wholly rests on the antithesis. His folly, therefore, betrays itself both in his arguments and in his citations of scripture proofs. With no more propriety does he treat of the word righteousness when he says “that faith was reckoned to Abraham for righteousness,” because that, after having embraced Christ (who is the righteousness of God, and God himself), he was eminent for the greatest virtues. Whence it appears that of two good parts he erroneously makes one corrupt whole; for the righteousness there mentioned does not belong to the whole course of Abraham’s life; but rather the Spirit testifies that, notwithstanding the singular eminence of Abraham’s virtues, and his laudable and persevering advancement in them, yet he did not please God any otherwise than in receiving by faith the grace offered in the promise. Whence it follows that in justification there is no regard paid to the works, as Paul conclusively argues in that passage.

Again he says:

Whom, therefore, the Lord receives into fellowship, him he is said to justify; because he cannot receive any one into favor or into fellowship with himself, without making him from a sinner to be a righteous person. This, we add, is accomplished by the remission of sins. For if they whom the Lord has reconciled to himself be judged according to their works, they will still be found actually sinners, who, notwithstanding, must be absolved and free from sin. It appears, then, that those whom God receives are made righteous no otherwise than as they are purified by being cleansed from all their defilements by the remission of their sins; so that such a righteousness may, in one word, be denominated a remission of sins. Both these points are fully established by the language of Paul, which I have already recited. "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation." Then he adds the substance of his ministry: "He hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." The terms "righteousness" and "reconciliation" are here used by him indiscriminately, to teach us that they are mutually comprehended in each other. And he states the manner of obtaining this righteousness to consist in our transgressions not being imputed to us. Wherefore we can

125

no longer doubt how God justifies, when we hear that he reconciles us to himself by not imputing our sins to us.

He makes the same use of Acts xiii. 38, 39 that we do, and says, "The apostle thus connects 'forgiveness of sins' with 'justification,' to show that they are identically the same." That Calvin sometimes uses language which seems to imply that the righteousness of Christ is imputed to us for justification is true; yet he does not distinguish between the active and the passive righteousness of Christ, but considers his holy life and sacrificial death as constituting the righteousness of Christ, which being imputed to us, we are reputed righteous before God, and not of ourselves. This language is somewhat ambiguous, but it is clear and pointed in this, that it makes justification a work done for us, and not a work done in us or by us.

§ 8. John Wesley on Justification.

As this subject is of so vast importance, and as any tendency among us toward Romish, High-church, or Broad-church views of justification—as both a real and a relative work, one which makes

us righteous as well as pardons our sin—should be checked promptly and effectually, we cite a passage or two from Mr. Wesley's admirable sermon on "Justification by Faith," on Rom. iv. 5: "To him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness."

But what is it to be *justified*? What is *justification*? This was the second thing which I proposed to show. And it is evident, from what has been already observed, that it is not the being made actually just and righteous. This is *sanctification*; which is, indeed, in some degree, the immediate fruit of justification, but, nevertheless, is a distinct gift of God and of a totally different nature. The one implies what God does for us through his Son; the other what he works in us by his Spirit. So that, although some rare instances may be found wherein the term *justified* or *justification* is used in so wide a sense as to include *sanctification* also, yet in general use they are sufficiently distinguished from each other, both by St. Paul and the other inspired writers. . . . The plain scriptural notion of justification is pardon, the forgiveness of sins. It is that act of God the Father, whereby, for the sake of the propitiation made by the blood of his Son, he "showeth forth his righteousness (or mercy) by the remission of the sins that are past." This is the easy, natural account of it given by St. Paul throughout this whole Epistle. So he explains it himself, more particularly in this and in the following chapter. Thus, in the next verses but one to the text, "Blessed are they," saith he, "whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered: blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin." To him that is justified

or forgiven, God "will not impute sin" to his condemnation. He will not condemn him on that account, either in this world or in that which is to come. His sins, all his past sins, in thought, word, and deed, are covered, are blotted out, shall not be remembered or mentioned against him any more than if they had not been. God will not inflict on that sinner what he deserved to suffer, because the Son of his love hath suffered for him. And from the time we are "accepted through the Beloved," "reconciled to God through his blood," he loves, and blesses, and watches over us for good, even as if we had never sinned.

Indeed the apostle in one place seems to extend the meaning of the word much farther, where he says, "Not the hearers of the law, but the doers of the law, shall be justified." Here he appears to refer our justification to the sentence of the great day. And so our Lord himself unquestionably doth, when he says, "By thy words thou shalt be justified;" proving thereby that "for every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give an account in the day of judgment:" but perhaps we can hardly produce another instance of St. Paul's using the word in that distant sense.

In the general tenor of his writings it is evident he doth not; and least of all in the text before us, which undeniably speaks, not of those who have already "finished their course," but of those who are now *just setting out*, just beginning to "run the race which is set before them."

§ 9. Objections Answered.

An objector might still ask, "If pardon is substantially the same as justification, why is the latter term so frequently used in preference to the former?" The Rev. Benjamin Field assigns two reasons for this, with which we close this discussion:

1. "The blessing in question is conferred upon mankind in a manner which exhibits the righteousness or justice of God in equal prominence with his goodness and mercy." "The forgiveness of sin may be the act of mere mercy, not only without any respect to the dictates of justice, but in violation of its principles. *Justification* is an act of mercy, indeed, but of mercy in connection with justice, and under its control. It is mercy that pardons, but justice that justifies." Here the grand doctrine of the atonement of Christ is brought into view. A Being of infinite dignity has become the voluntary and all-sufficient Surety for sinful men. He died, the just for the unjust, sustaining the penalty of the law, and meeting the demands of justice, and on this account the law itself consents to the pardon of the offender, and God, in his official character of *judge*, shows mercy upon terms that are consistent with a *righteous* government. Thus, "grace reigns through righteousness." God "is faithful and *just* to forgive us our sins" (1 John i. 9)—"*just* and the *justifier* of him that believeth." (See Rom. iii. 21–26.)

2. The blessing in question invests men with all the privileges of righteousness. Pardon may signify nothing more than a remission of the penalty due to sin. Justification involves a restoration to forfeited immunities and privileges. The man is accounted righteous, ana is treated as such—treated in relation to God and eternity as an innocent and holy being. It is as if a deed were put into his hand entitling him to be henceforth dealt with as one would be who had performed the whole condition of the covenant of life. The whole matter, then, may be summed up in the following language: "Justification is that act of God,

viewed as our righteous and yet merciful Judge, by which, for the sake of the satisfaction and merits of Christ, embraced and applied to the heart by faith, he discharges the criminal at his bar, and treats him as a just person, in full accordance with the untarnished holiness of his own nature, and the inviolable rectitude of his administrations."

§ 10. Conclusion.

It is not necessary to prolong the discussion of this subject, though its vital importance inclines us to linger upon it. It is fully discussed, and the Protestant view triumphantly defended, in Knapp's Theology, Sections 108–115. Knapp says emphatically: "The Bible makes justification the mere forgiveness of sins—*i. e.*, removal of the punishment of them." He repudiates as Socinian and Romish error the notion that *justificatio interna* is taught in Rom. v.; but he holds it is *justificatio externa*, and says, "The terms *justification*, pardon, accounting righteous, occur in the Bible much more frequently in this sense than in any other, and so are synonymous with forgiveness of sins." In Shedd's "History of Christian Doctrine," Book V., this branch of Soteriology is largely handled, and the Romish notion of justification, as comprehending sanctification, is traced to Augustin. Shedd says mildly: "The difference between the judicial and the renovating side of redemption was not always kept in view by that usually sharp and aquiline eye." See also Hagenbach's "History of Doctrines," Sections 251, 252; Ralston's "Elements," IV., 28–33; Watson's "Institutes," II., 23; and especially the article on Justification in his Dictionary. There is a capital, concise statement of the doctrine, with a brief history of opinions concerning it, in McClintock and Strong's Cyclopedia, with a list of works on the subject which may be consulted.

[In full harmony with the foregoing discussion are Dr. Pope's definitions of *Justification* and of *Justifying Faith*:

> Justification is the divine judicial act which applies to the sinner, believing in Christ, the benefit of the atonement, delivering him from the condemnation of his sin, introducing him into a state of favor, and treating him as a righteous person.[3]
>
> The faith which is the condition and instrument of justification is the trust of the soul in Christ as the only propitiation for human sin. It is a personal act of the penitent sinner under the influence of the Holy Spirit, who reveals the atonement to the mind, infuses desire into the heart, and thus persuades the will to embrace the Saviour. This faith, as receptive, renounces self in every form, obtains forgiveness, and is reckoned for righteousness: these being one blessing under two aspects.[4]

1. Wheatly differs from this view. He says: “Wherever else in the New Testament we meet with the word ἀφίημι (which we render *remit* in the text), applied to sins, as it is here it is constantly used to express the remission and forgiveness of them, or the entire putting them away; and therefore the use of the same terms, in the text I am speaking of, inclines me to interpret the commission there given of a power to remit sins, even in relation to God; insomuch that those sins which the apostles should declare forgiven by virtue of this commission should be actually forgiven by God himself, so as to be imputed no more.” But he thinks this power belonged to them in the same way as that of miraculous healing. He refers to what our Lord said to the paralytic when he healed him: “Thy sins be forgiven thee.” (Matt. ix. 2 *ff.*) But we never read of the apostles thus addressing those whom they healed, or any others. Wheatly refers to James v. 14, 15, but that only says, “The prayer of faith shall save the sick, and if he have committed sins they shall be forgiven him”—a very different matter. The apostles bound and loosed offenders and penitents in regard to Church censures. (1 Cor, v. 4-6; 2 Cor. ii. 10; 1 Tim. i. 20; *cf.* Matt. xvi. 18, 19; xviii. 18.) In passing, we may express our regret at the Jesuitical way in which the language of James, “Confess your faults one to another, and pray for one another that ye may be healed,” is made to refer to auricular confession to a priest—“the apostle’s advice to call for the elders of the Church, and to confess our faults, in order to engage their fervent prayers.”↩
2. See Summers’s “Commentary on the Ritual,” pp. 52, 53. Dr. Summers probably never did, within small compass, a more useful work for the Church than the preparation of this manual. It is a well-nigh perfect performance of its kind. It meets a real want, and should be republished in such form as to secure its general circulation.—T.↩
3. “Compendium,” etc., Vol. II., p. 407.↩
4. *Ibid.*, p. 411.↩

Part IV.

Article X.
Of Good Works.

128

Although good works, which are the fruits of faith, and follow after justification, cannot put away our sins, and endure the severity of God's judgment; yet are they pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ, and spring out of a true and lively faith, insomuch that by them a lively faith may be as evidently known as a tree is discerned by its fruit.

Introduction.

This article is the same as Article XII. in the Anglican Confession, except that "although" is substituted for "albeit that," "spring out" for "do spring out necessarily," and "is discerned by its fruit" for "discerned by the fruit." These verbal changes are for the better. "Necessarily" is well omitted, as the ambiguity might lead some to think that faith produces good works without any distinct volition on our part. If "living" had been put for "lively" (*viva* in the Latin) it might have been better.

This article was not one of the Forty-two Articles of King Edward's reign, but was added in 1562. It is slightly varied from the article in the Württemberg Confession. It was added to the preceding article on Justification to guard it from an unscriptural Solifidianism. This was the more necessary, as Agricola had grafted Antinomianism on the Lutheran doctrine of justification by faith, and Luther himself had spoken very unadvisedly on this subject; moreover the nature of imputed righteousness, as held by Antinomians, tended to make void the law. It was thought as important to have an article on Good Works as to have one on Justification by Faith—just as the Epistle of James and the practical conclusions of Paul's Epistles are as necessary, as their doctrinal portions in Galatians and Romans, and elsewhere. Three things here demand discussion: *first*, What are here meant by good works? *secondly*, What two things are predicated of them negatively? and *thirdly*, What two things are predicated of them positively?

Chapter I.
The Works Designated Good.

§ 1. Good Works before Justification.

129
The article makes no distinction between works of piety, embracing the duties of the first table—those which relate to God—and works of morality, embracing the duties of the second table—those which relate to man, justice, and mercy. As these all "are the fruits of faith," they must be all comprehended in this general designation.

But they are said to "follow after justification;" and this would seem to imply that no works before justification are to be considered good. Indeed, in the Anglican Confession, Article XIII., which follows this, is entitled, "Of Works before Justification," and of these it is said:

> Works done before the grace of Christ, and the inspiration of his Spirit, are not pleasant to God, forasmuch as they spring not of faith in Jesus Christ; neither do they make men meet to receive grace, or (as the school authors say) deserve grace of congruity; yea, rather, for that they are not done as God hath willed and commanded them to be done, we doubt not but they have the nature of sin.

Mr. Wesley did well to omit that article. It is ambiguous and unguarded—and the more so, as the title seems to imply that man can perform no works but such as have the nature of sin, under the influence and by the aid of preventing grace.

§ 2. Mr. Wesley on Good Works in General.

In his sermon before the Humane Society (Ser. 99) Mr. Wesley makes, as he says, "a few reflections upon good works in general," thus:

> I am not insensible that many, even serious people, are jealous of all that is spoken upon this subject; nay, and whenever the necessity of good works is strongly insisted on, take for granted that he who speaks in this manner is but one remove from Popery. But should we, for fear of this or of

any other reproach, refrain from speaking “the truth as it is in Jesus?” Should we, on any consideration, “shun to declare the whole counsel of God?” Nay, if a false prophet could utter that solemn word, how much more may the ministers of

Christ? We cannot go beyond the word of the Lord, to speak either more or less.“ Is it not to be lamented that any who fear God should desire us to do otherwise, and that by speaking otherwise themselves they should occasion the way of truth to be evil spoken of? I mean, in particular, the way of salvation by faith, which, on this very account, is despised, nay, held in abomination, by many sensible men. It is now above forty years since this grand scriptural doctrine, ”By grace ye are saved through faith” began to be openly declared by a few clergymen of the Church of England. And not long after, some who heard, but did not understand, attempted to preach the same doctrine, but miserably mangled it; wresting the scripture, and “making void the law through faith.”

Some of these, in order to exalt the value of faith, have utterly depreciated good works. They speak of them as not only not necessary to salvation, but as greatly obstructive to it. They represent them as abundantly more dangerous than evil ones to those who are seeking to save their souls. One cries aloud: “More people go to hell by praying than by thieving.” Another screams out: “Away with your works! Have done with your works, or you cannot come to Christ!” And this unscriptural, irrational, heathenish declaration is called *preaching the gospel!* But “shall not the Judge of all the earth” speak, as well as do right? Will not he “be justified in his saying, and clear when he is judged?” Assuredly he will. And upon his authority we must continue to declare that whenever you do good to any for his sake; when you feed the hungry, give drink to the thirsty; when you assist the stranger, or clothe the naked; when you visit them that are sick or in prison—these are not *splendid sins*, as one marvelously calls them, but “sacrifices wherewith God is well pleased.” Not that our Lord intended we should confine our beneficence to the bodies of men. He undoubtedly designed that we should be equally abundant in works of spiritual mercy. He died to purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of *all* good works; zealous, above all, to save souls from death, and thereby hide a multitude of sins. And this is unquestionably included in St. Paul’s exhortation, “As we have time, let us do good unto all men;” good in every possible kind, as well as in every possible degree. But why does not our blessed Lord mention works of spiritual mercy? He could not do it with any propriety. It was not for him to say, “I was in error, and you convinced me; I was in sin, and you brought me back to God.” And it needed not; for, in mentioning *some*, he included *all* works of mercy.

But may I not add one thing more (only he that heareth, let him understand)? Good works are so far from being hinderances of our

salvation; they are so far from being insignificant, from being of no account in Christianity, that, supposing them to spring from a right principle, they are the perfection of religion. They are the highest part of that spiritual building whereof Jesus Christ is the foundation. To those who attentively consider the thirteenth chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians, it will be undeniably plain that what St. Paul there describes as the highest of all Christian graces is properly and directly the love of our neighbor. And to him who attentively considers the whole tenor, both of the Old and New Testaments, it will be equally plain that works springing from this love are the highest part of the religion therein revealed. Of these our Lord himself says, "Herein is my Father glorified, that ye bring forth much fruit." Much *fruit!* Does not the very expression imply the excellency of what is so

131

termed? Is not the tree itself for the sake of the fruit? By bearing fruit, and by this alone, it attains the highest perfection it is capable of, and answers the end for which it was planted. Who, what is he, then, that is called a Christian, and can speak lightly of good works?[1]

§ 3. Such Good Works Not Splendid Sins.

It was Augustin who called the works in question "splendid sins," and his modern followers have done the same. But it is absurd to call acts of piety or of charity "sins," though qualified by the epithet "splendid." The man who performs them with an improper motive sins in their performance. But if any one does such act under the promptings of God's Spirit and grace, which operates on all men, he does not sin in so doing. Their performance does not hinder his justification: it rather facilitates it, if he is earnestly seeking it. How is he to get more grace except by using the grace already given, and by employing the means of grace? Surely repentance, which comprehends conviction, contrition, and renunciation of sin, is not sin. Surely prayer for the pardon of sin is not sin.

§ 4. Bishop Browne on the Thirteenth English Article.

The framers of the Thirteenth Anglican Article, when they gave it its title, must have used the term justification with some latitude of meaning, as comprehending the preventing grace which leads to it. We find that Bishop Browne entertains a similar view. He says

("Exposition," p. 335):

As regards the *title* of the article, "Of Works Done Before Justification," we must observe that it was probably adopted because the question discussed in the article itself went, at the time of the Reformation and the Council of Trent, under that name. All questions concerning merit *de congruo*, and works done before grace, were considered as embraced in the general term, "The question concerning works before justification." The article itself says nothing about justification. All that it determines is, that in order for works to be acceptable to God, they must be done by the grace of God, and must spring from a principle of faith.

But as this article is not in our Confession, we have no more to do with it than to make this reference to it as it stands related to our article "Of Good Works."

§ 5. Definition of Good Works.

It may be said, in general, that every thing which God has commanded, and which is done because God has commanded it,

132

his Spirit moving thereto, and his grace assisting in its performance, is a good work, by whomsoever performed.

If done t'obey thy laws,
E'en servile labors shine:
Hallowed is toil if this the cause—
The meanest task divine.

§ 6. Scriptural Examples Considered.

From the days of Clement to the present, the question has been discussed whether or not the good acts of the grateful Naaman, the repentant Ninevites, the pious Cornelius, and the Gentiles spoken of in Rom. ii., are to be considered as good works, pleasing and acceptable to God, inasmuch as those who performed them knew nothing of justification, or of faith in Christ, as its condition. It is not surprising that the question has generally been decided in their favor; it is surprising that any sensible man should have decided otherwise. The Scriptures say that these pious heathen were accepted of God, and that settles the question. God approves of

every thing that is good in itself, and considers it a good work in him who performs it—whether he be Gentile, Jew, or Christian—as "the grace of Christ and the inspiration of his Spirit" are as "wide as the reach of Satan's rage," and co-extensive with the universal atonement. It was in reference to one of the cases adduced—that of Cornelius—that Peter said: "Of a truth, I perceive that God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation, he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted of him." (Acts x. 34, 35.) And this chapter shows that though no good works "make men meet to receive grace, or, as the school authors say, deserve grace of congruity," yet Cornelius's fear of God, fasting, alms, and prayer, were "had in remembrance before God," and his improvement of preventing grace led to the bestowment of more grace, and resulted in his salvation. This is God's method. It is absurd to speak of any merit on the part of man, whether of condignity or of congruity.

Thou all our works in us hast wrought,
Our good is all divine:
The praise of every virtuous thought
And righteous word is thine.
From thee. through Jesus, we receive
The power on thee to call,
In whom we are and move and live—
Our God is all in all!

---

1. "Wesley's Sermons," Vol. IV., pp. 123–125.↩

Chapter II.
Relation of Good Works to Sin and Divine Judgment.

133
Of good works done after justification two things are denied.

§ 1. Good Works Cannot Put Away Sin.

It is denied that they can put away sin.

As the notion that any works performed by us can atone for our past sins is so preposterous, one might wonder why this clause was inserted in the article. But the reason can be found in the abuse of some of the unguarded expressions of the Fathers and schoolmen. Hermas speaks of the martyrs having "all their offenses blotted out, because they have suffered death for the name of the Son of God." Tertullian says, "All sins are forgiven to martyrdom." They held that baptism cleansed away all previous sins, and inferred that the baptism of blood (by which they meant martyrdom) had all the virtue of the baptism of water. It is thus that one error begets another. The schoolmen held to merit of congruity before justification, and merit of condignity after. They did not really mean to say that the merit of either sort atoned for sin; but their doctrine tended to this view, which was held by many in the Romish Church. Indeed, they held that a man might merit so much of God as to have his good works set down to the credit of others for the forgiveness of their sins! So great development is there in error! Now, it is impossible to see what atoning merit there can be in the good works of any one, saint or angel. All are under law to God, and are bound to obey him. Their obedience requires all their powers and demands all their time. Where then can there be any merit? What time can there be for the performance of good works, not required for the present, which can be put down as an offset to sins committed in the past?

What though my life henceforth be thine,
Present for past can ne'er atone;
Though I to thee the whole resign,

I only give thee back thine own.

134

Suppose it possible to perform every duty in perfection; suppose that every day and every moment we love the Lord our God with all our heart, with all our soul, with all our mind, with all our strength, and our neighbor as ourselves, and that without any of the infirmities which cleave to us in this life, but with the perfection of angels—what then? The Saviour tells us: “So likewise ye, when ye shall have done all those things which are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants: we have done that which was our duty to do.” (Luke xvii. 10.) We have just done our duty, nothing more. We are unprofitable servants, that is, we bring no profit to our divine Master. “Can a man be profitable unto God, as he that is wise may be profitable unto himself? Is it any pleasure to the Almighty, that thou art righteous? or is it gain to him, that thou makest thy ways perfect?” (Job xxii. 2, 3.) “Thou art my Lord: my goodness extended not to thee; but to the saints that are in the earth.” (Ps. xvi. 2, 3.) These passages show that while a man benefits himself and his neighbor by his goodness, he cannot thereby benefit the infinite Jehovah, so as to make amends for any sins that he may have committed against him. And it must be borne in mind that however much we may wrong our neighbor, sins, in the proper sense, have God for their object, and “none can forgive sins but God only.” David had done great wrong against Uriah and Bathsheba and his own family, yet when he seeks forgiveness of sin he comes to God for it, and, in that regard, loses sight of all others whom he may have injured. “Have mercy upon me, O God, according to thy loving-kindness: according unto the multitude of thy tender mercies, blot out my transgressions. Against thee, thee only, have I sinned, and done this evil in thy sight.” (Ps. li. 1–4.) He confesses his sin to God; he asks forgiveness of God; he pleads nothing but the mercy of God; he promises future obedience, but never dreamed that that would, in the slightest degree, “put away his sin.”

§ 2. Good Works Cannot Endure the Divine Scrutiny.

The article proceeds to say that our good works cannot endure the severity of God’s judgment.

This opposes the doctrine of merit *de condigno*, already considered. As our good works cannot put away, (*expiare*) atone for past sins, so they cannot merit eternal life. By the severity

of God's judgment we are to understand the strict scrutiny which he will make into all our actions in the day of judgment, when he shall judge the secrets of all hearts. "For God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil." (Eccl. xii. 14.)

Allowing it possible for any one to use preventing grace till it develops into regenerating and sanctifying grace, and to use the latter all through life, so as never to commit actual sin, and supposing any one were thus to live, would he possess merit *de condigno*? Would he deserve heaven? Would he have rendered the *quid pro quo*, so as to be entitled to eternal life? Granted that his good works were performed by the power of Christ and through the Spirit, would they, after undergoing the severity of God's judgment, be pronounced so meritorious as to deserve everlasting life? They would not. The merit, after all, comes from Christ: the power of performance from the Holy Spirit. Besides, if we could find a real character corresponding to this abstract ideal, we should still find in him, not an angel, not an unfallen human being, but one who brought with him into the world a depraved nature, a soul affected in every department, intellect, sensibility, and will, by original sin, and a body subject to appetites and infirmities and temptations, which, whether he so wills it or not, very greatly interferes with the obedience which a creature made in the image of God owes to his Creator. The severity of God's judgment takes all these into consideration, and he is forced to pronounce adversely to any claim which such a man might be supposed to make on the score of merit, for the rewards of heaven. Indeed, such a man would be the last to make such a claim. Such a man in life would say,

> Every moment, Lord, I want
> The merit of thy death

and at its close he would still say,

> Our title to heaven his merits we take.

But how stands the case actually—not the ideal, but the real? How is it with us, "after justification?" We are regenerated, and so

bring forth good works. But how often do we pray God to forgive the iniquity of unholy things! How do we mourn over our proneness to wander from God—"our scanty grace;" our neglect of duty; our imperfect performance of it; our "secret

faults," when we are not chargeable with "presumptuous sins;" our slowness in cleansing ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit and perfecting holiness in the fear of God! We never knew a Christian who did not have to pray, "Forgive us our trespasses." "And enter not into judgment with thy servant; for in thy sight shall no man living be justified." (Ps. cxliii. 2.) "Lord, hear my voice: let thine ears be attentive to the voice of my supplications. If thou, Lord, shouldst mark iniquities, O Lord, who shall stand? But there is forgiveness with thee, that thou mayest be feared." (Ps. cxxx. 2–4.)

If we can detect and censure our secret faults, how much more shall the severity of God's judgment bring them to light, and show them in their true character and just deserts! We may see no defects in certain performances, and they may be extolled by others as perfect and highly meritorious, but we must remember the language of Paul, "But with me it is a very small thing that I should be judged of you, or of man's judgment: yea, I judge not mine own self. For I know nothing by myself;[1] yet am I not hereby justified: but he that judgeth me is the Lord." (1 Cor. iv. 3, 4)

But we need not enlarge on this subject in this place, as the folly of claiming justification here or hereafter on the score of human merit was fully shown in the exposition of the Ninth Article.

---

1. The Revised Version translates, "For I know nothing *against* myself." The Greek is οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐμαυτῷ *σύνοιδα*; "for I am conscious of nothing against myself."—T.↩

Chapter III.
Positive Characteristics of Good Works.

I. Good Works Acceptable to God.

137
The first of the two points affirmed in the present article is this: that though our good works have no merit, "yet are they pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ." They must be pleasing and acceptable to God, because (1) they are performed according to his will, (2) by the help of his grace, and (3) to the glory of his name.

§ 1. Good Works Divinely Prescribed.

Good works are such as are divinely prescribed according to the will of God.

We are not left to nature's voice,
To know and serve the Lord.

We do not ascertain our duty merely by the light of nature, conscience, or philosophy. These of themselves are mere *ignes fatui,* which bewilder, but do not guide us into the good and the right way. Man has neither the capacity, because of the ignorance of his mind in his fallen state; nor the prerogative, because he is a subject, not a sovereign, and a rebellious subject in that state of depravity; so that "the race" of duty must be "set before him." God himself must prescribe his duty; then there will be the necessary elements in a perfect legislation: certainty and authority. This sets aside all will worship and work. God censured the Jews, because, says he, "their fear toward me is taught by the precept of men." (Isa. xxix. 13.) Or, as it is expressed by our Lord, "In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men," (Mark vii. 7; *cf.* Col. ii. 20–23.)

God has not left himself without witness as the great Lawgiver, nor has he left us without instruction as to what he requires of us. He wrote his law on two tables of stone; he caused it to be written, amplified, and explained in his Holy Word; he transcribes it by his

Spirit on the fleshly tables of our hearts. “He hath showed thee, O man, what is good; and what

doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?” (Micah vi. 8.) “Thou shall love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets.” (Matt. xxii. 37–40.) “The fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance: against such there is no law. And they that are Christ’s have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts.” (Gal. v. 22–24) “For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast. For we are his workmanship created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them.” (Eph. ii. 8–10.) “Whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things, are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things.” (Phil. iv. 8.)

To set forth our duty with the greatest perspicuity, authority, and attractiveness, the Eternal Word was sent into the world to make a revelation of the mind and will of God to man, and to illustrate it in his own beautiful example of incarnate virtue: imitable, because he was man as well as God; and worthy of all imitation, because he was God as well as man.

Truly good works, performed in accordance with such divine prescription and after such a model, cannot but be pleasing and acceptable to God.

§ 2. Good Works Performed by Divine Grace.

Good works are such as are performed by the aid of divine grace. The good works in question are those which follow after justification. It must not be imagined that when a man is regenerated his powers are so sanctified and strengthened that he can perform his duty independently of the Holy Spirit’s assistance,

or that “a stock of grace” is given to him which will last him for life. No, verily, as he every moment needs the merit of the Son to keep him in a state of justification, so every moment he needs the grace of the Spirit to keep him in a state

139

of holiness, and to enable him to every good word and work. “Lord, thou wilt ordain peace for us: for thou also hast wrought all our works in us.” (Isa. xxvi. 12.) “For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named, that he would grant you, according to the riches of his glory, to be strengthened with might by his spirit in the inner man; that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith; that ye, being rooted and grounded in love, may be able to comprehend with all saints what is the breadth, and length, and depth, and height; and to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge, that ye might be filled with all the fullness of God. Now unto him that is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think, according to the power that worketh in us, unto him be glory in the Church by Christ Jesus throughout all ages, world without end. Amen.” (Eph. iii. 14–21.) “Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling: for it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure.” (Phil. ii. 12, 13.) “Now the God of peace make you perfect in every good work to do his will, working in you that which is well pleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ.” (Heb. xiii. 20, 21.) “Now unto him that is able to keep you from falling, and to present you faultless before the presence of his glory with exceeding joy, to the only wise God our Saviour, be glory and majesty, dominion and power, both now and ever. Amen.” (Jude 24, 25.)

We could multiply synergistic passages of this sort, showing that while grace cannot perform these good works without our cooperation, we cannot perform them without the aid of grace. But we have fully discussed this subject under the Eighth Article. It requires no argument to prove that the works performed by the power of the Spirit and grace of God are “well pleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ.”

§ 3. Good Works Redound to the Divine Glory.

Good works are such as are performed to the glory of God. The fanatical doctrine that the end justifies and sanctifies the means, no matter what they may be, is indeed detestable. Robbery and lying and murder, forsooth, are all right if done *ad majoram gloriam Dei*—to the greater glory of God! Paul indignantly denounces this diabolical casuistry: "For if the truth of

God hath more abounded through my lie unto his glory; why yet am I also judged as a sinner? And not rather (as we be slanderously reported, and as some affirm that we say), Let us do evil, that good may come? whose damnation is just." (Rom. iii. 7, 8.)

But any action, not in itself immoral, becomes a good work, when performed in accordance with the will of God, by his help and to his glory.

The Scriptures abound with exhortations, prayers, and examples, to this effect. "Give unto the Lord the glory due unto his name." (Ps. xxix. 2.) "Whoso offereth praise glorifieth me; and to him that ordereth his conversation aright will I show the salvation of God." (Ps. l. 23.) "Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works and glorify your Father which is in heaven." (Matt. v. 16.) "Herein is my father glorified, that ye bear much fruit, so shall ye be my disciples." (John xv. 8.) "Whether therefore ye eat, or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God." (1 Cor. x. 31.) "And they glorified God in me." (Gal. i. 24) "And this I pray that your love may abound yet more and more in knowledge and in all judgment; that ye may approve things that are excellent; that ye may be sincere and without offense till the day of Christ; being filled with the fruits of righteousness, which are by Jesus Christ, unto the glory and praise of God." (Phil. i. 9–11.) "And whatsoever ye do in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God and the Father by him." (Col. iii. 17.) "Dearly beloved, I beseech you, as strangers and pilgrims, abstain from fleshly lusts, which war against the soul; having your conversation honest among the Gentiles; that, whereas they speak against you as evil doers, they may by your good works, which they shall behold, glorify God in the day of visitation." (1 Pet. ii. 11, 12.) Such passages might be multiplied; let these suffice.

The actions which we perform in accordance with his will, and by the aid of his grace, will be sure to redound to his glory, because they illustrate his perfections, recognize his authority, magnify his

government, advance his cause, benefit his creatures, and secure our own welfare. It needs no argument or Scripture testimony, though abundance of both might be readily furnished, to prove that such good works "are pleasing and acceptable to God, in Christ."

141

We should keep this golden triad like a phylactery on our head and heart and hands:

Our strength, thy grace; our rule thy word;
Our end, the glory of the Lord!

II. Good Works the Fruit of Faith.

The article further affirms of good works that they "spring out of a true and lively faith, insomuch that by them a lively faith may be as evidently known as a tree is discerned by its fruit."

§ 1. Contrast of Living and Dead Faith.

The framers of the article evidently had in view the contrast between a true and a living faith and a false and a dead faith, in James ii. 14–26. Here the Apostle tells us that a faith which consists merely in the assent of the mind to any proposition—say the existence of one God—being inoperative, is utterly worthless. "Thou believest there is one God; thou doest well"—that is, the proposition is correct; "the devils also believe and tremble. But wilt thou know; O vain man, that faith without works is dead? For as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also." A living faith is operative, productive: it worketh by love, purifieth the heart, overcometh the world, and quencheth all the fiery darts of the wicked one.

This is the faith of which Paul speaks in Rom. x. 10: "For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." Heart here means "the inward man," "the hidden man of the heart," the soul, or spiritual nature of man, as distinct from "the outward man," the body and the external life.

The faith of the heart, then, is the assent of the intellect to the gospel, together with the consent of the affections, and the

concurrence of the will as the conative working power of the soul. Hence it is said "with the heart man believeth unto righteousness." His faith, in the order of thought, first justifies, but in the order of time there is no difference; it renews, as an instrument, the moral nature, so that in the same instant a man is born again. "But now being made free from sin, and become servants of God, ye have your fruit unto holiness and the end everlasting life." (Rom. vi. 22; *cf.* John i. 12, 18; Rom. viii. 1–17; 2 Cor. v. 17.)

142

This faith brings "the Invisible to sight," and so fastens our eyes upon the glorious object that we experience an assimilating power, so that we become like that which thus absorbs our attention. "But we all, with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord." (2 Cor. iii. 18; *cf.* 1 John iii. 3; iv. 17.)

Faith is a receiving and appropriating grace. It receives and appropriates the merit of Christ for justification, and also the power of the spirit for sanctification and every good work. This is God's established method: "God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation, through sanctification of the spirit and belief of the truth." (2 Thess. ii. 13.)

§ 2. Our Lord's Test.

This is our Lord's test: "Every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit. A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit; neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit. Therefore by their fruits ye shall know them." (Matt. vii. 17–20; *cf.* Matt. xii. 33–37; 1 John iii. 7.) Hypocrites may indeed for awhile simulate the virtues of the righteous; but they will not long escape detection; and in every case the tares will be distinguished from the wheat when the reaping-time shall come. The corrupt tree shall be known by its fruits, the barren tree by its having "nothing but leaves;" and it shall be cut down and cast into the fire. Factitious virtues, as they spring from no internal source of vitality, will soon shrivel and fall. One of our missionaries in Shanghai told us that a Chinaman once sold him a beautiful peach-tree whose fruitfulness was attested by the multitude of luscious peaches that were on its branches. He paid a high price for so rare a tree. But, on

looking at it a few days after, he found that all the peaches were shriveled and dead. On examination he ascertained that they were fastened to the boughs by pins: they were not produced by the tree, which was worthless.

But if good fruit be produced by a tree we pronounce that tree good; all the world calls it a good tree. If a tree produces no fruit, or bad fruit, if no good fruit grows upon it, no one calls it a good tree. It is all one to say that good works are the fruits of faith, or of the spirit, or of the renewed nature. The renewed nature is the soil out of which they grow; the Spirit creates

that renewed nature, gives the nurture and heat necessary for the development of the fruit, and faith which is of the operation of God, is the instrumental agency by which all the processes are carried on to perfection.

We thus see that this article is complemental to that on justification, and guards it effectually from all Antinomian perversion and abuse.

§ 3. Dr. Pope on "Living Faith."

[The expression living faith, just used, suggests the vital relation of this subject to union with Christ. When St. Paul says "that we might be made the righteousness of God in him" (2 Cor. v. 21), the word γινώμεθα means more than the non-imputation of sin which has been spoken of before. "That we might become:" our forensic justification being included of necessity, our moral conformity to the divine righteousness cannot be excluded. These closing words are a resumption, but in a more emphatic and enlarged form, of the preceding paragraph, which ended with "If any man be in Christ he is a new creature." "The righteousness of God in him" is the full realization of the new method of conforming us to his attribute of righteousness. It is impossible to establish the distinction between *in Christ* for external righteousness, and *Christ in us* for righteousness internal. These are only different aspects of one and the same union with Christ. Still, the distinction may be used for illustration. We are "accepted in the Beloved, in whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins," in order that "Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith:" that his grace "may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus." (Eph. i. 6, 7; iii. 17; Col. i. 28.) The vital union of faith secures both objects: our being reckoned as righteous because found in him, and our being made righteous because he is in us as the Spirit of life and strength unto all obedience: "that the

righteousness of the law may be fulfilled in us." (Rom. viii. 2, 4.) "He that is joined to the Lord is one Spirit" (1 Cor. vi. 17), and this Holy Spirit, common to Him and to us, gradually realizes the ideal righteousness of God within by a sure necessity. . . . St. Paul and St. James agree that the state of justification is that of a "faith which worketh by love." (Gal. v. 6.) St. John mediates, "He that doeth righteousness is righteous" (1 John iii. 7): this would be tautology did he not mean that the righteous man—he who in the well-known terminology of St, Paul, which St. John does not use, is the justified man—is one who worketh righteousness, "even as He is righteous" who is the Author and Finisher and Pattern of human righteousness.[1]]

---

1. Pope's "Compendium," etc., Vol. II., pp. 416, 417.↩

Part V.

Article XI.
Of Works of Supererogation.

144

Voluntary works, besides over and above God's commandments, which are called works of supererogation, cannot be taught without arrogancy and impiety. For by them men do declare that they do not only render unto God as much as they are bound to do, but that they do more for his sake than of bounden duty is required: whereas Christ saith plainly, When ye have done all that is commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants.

Introduction.

This article corresponds to Article XIV. of the Anglican Confession, except that the words "which are called" are substituted for "which they call"—meaning the papists—and "is commanded you" for "are commanded to you:" unimportant alterations. The words πάντα τά in Luke xvii. 10, are rendered in the Vulgate *omnia quae*, but in the Latin recension of the article *omnia quaecunque*; so in the *Defensio* of Dr. Jo. Elis. Tyndale, Cranmer, Geneva, have "all those things which are commanded you," as in the Authorized Version. It is noteworthy that in the Latin recension the explanation of *opera, quae supererogationis appellant* is omitted. Elis does not ignore it; he renders, *opera voluntaria ultra et supra Dei praecepta, quae vocant opera supererogationis, non possunt sine arrogantia et impietate doceri.*

Chapter I.
The Roman Doctrine Stated.

§ 1. Supererogation Defined.

145
It seems proper, then, to define the word "supererogation," as it is not used in classical Latin. It comes from *super*, above, and *erogare*, to expend, or pay out money, and it is thus used in the Vulgate of Luke x. 35: *Et quodcunque supererogareris*, which is rendered in both of our versions, "And whatsoever thou spendest more"—that is, over and above the two pence, *denarii*, paid to the host. *Supererogation* is accordingly used, in theology, to denote the doing of more than duty requires—making up by over-plus service the deficiency of others. It is so used by Milton: "The fervency of one man in prayer cannot supererogate for the coldness of another."

§ 2. A Protestant Article.

At first view it seems that the insertion of such an article as this in the Confession is itself a work of supererogation; for who, it might be asked, could be not only so arrogant and impious, but so ignorant and absurd, as to think he can do more than God commands, so as to have merit which may be transferred to one who has failed in his duty?

But this is one of the articles of a *Protestant* Confession; and as such it is *a protest* against the popish doctrine of human merit and indulgences. Preposterous as it seems, and really is, the Romish Church teaches that men can perform "voluntary works over and above God's commandments, which they call works of supererogation." The Council of Trent, indeed, says nothing of "works of supererogation," *eo nomine*; but it anathematizes those who say indulgences are unprofitable, and these are granted by the Pope on the ground of the "deposit" consisting of the excess of merit of the greater saints, intrusted to the Church, and at the disposal of its visible head. Though the scandalous abuse of this

teaching, which excited the indignation of Luther and led to the Reformation, is not so wide-spread

now as when Tetzel hawked indulgences over the world, yet it still obtains, and therefore the protest against it is no anachronism; it is needed in the nineteenth century.

§ 3. Sources of the Error.

It may be difficult to trace this error *a stirpe*; but it is thought that the nucleus of it may be found in the unguarded eulogies of alms-giving and voluntary poverty, celibacy and martyrdom, in the writings of some of the Fathers.

The post-exile Jews attributed great merit to alms-giving, making it a defense from adversity and an atonement for sin. (Tobit iv. 10, 11; Ecclus. xxix. 10–13.) Their error was countenanced by some of the Fathers. Chrysostom says: "Water is not more adapted to wash away the spots of the body than the power of alms-deeds is to cleanse the soul." "You go into the church to obtain mercy: first show mercy—make God your debtor, and then you may ask of him, and receive with usury." "If many barbarous nations burn their goods together with their dead, how much more reasonable it is for you to give your child his goods when he is dead! Not to reduce them to ashes, but to make him the more glorious; if he be a sinner, to procure him pardon; if righteous, to add to his reward and retribution." After making due allowance for the rhetorical style of Chrysostom, we cannot but censure such teaching; it sounds more like Romish than Protestant or scriptural doctrine. In such passages, found in the Fathers, we trace the germ of the heresy in question. (*Cf.* Augustin's "City of God," xxi. 27, *ad finem*, where there are unguarded expressions of a similar tone.)

So with regard to celibacy. The merits of monkery were highly extolled by many of the Fathers, and their incautious language has given countenance to the shocking abuses of popery in this matter. In the discussion of Article X. we noticed the undue importance attached to martyrdom. Hermas says: "All the offenses of the martyrs were blotted out, because they have suffered death for the name of the Son of God." (Simil. ix. 29.) "All sins," says Tertullian, "are forgiven to martyrdom." Bishop Browne remarks: "In this

admiration of the early Church for martyrdom, and in the admission of the intercession of the martyrs for the deliverance of others from church censures, we may perhaps trace the germ of the doctrine of works of supererogation."

147

He makes a similar remark in regard to voluntary celibacy.

§ 4. Romish Doctrine of Satisfaction.

The Romish doctrine of satisfaction embraces this heresy. The mildest form in which it is set forth by Romanists is in the Catechism of the Council of Trent, "On the Sacrament of Penance:"

In satisfaction two things are particularly required; the one, that he who satisfies be in a state of grace, the friend of God: works done without faith and charity cannot be acceptable to God; the other, that the works performed be such as are of their own nature painful or laborious. They are a compensation for past sins, and, to use the words of St. Cyprian, "the redeemers, as it were, of sins," and must, therefore, be such as we have described. It does not, however, always follow that they are painful or laborious to those who undergo them: the influence of habit or the intensity of divine love frequently renders the soul insensible to things the most difficult to be endured. Such works, however, do not, therefore, cease to be satisfactory: it is the privilege of the children of God to be so inflamed with his love, that whilst undergoing the most cruel tortures for his sake, they are either entirely insensible to them, or at least bear them not only with fortitude but with the greatest joy.

The pastor will teach that every species of satisfaction is included under these three heads, prayer, fasting, and alms-deeds, which corresponds with these three sorts of goods, those of the soul, of the body, and what are called external goods, all of which are the gifts of God. Than these three sorts of satisfaction nothing can be more effectual in eradicating sin from the soul. Whatever is in the world is the lust of the flesh, the "lust of the eyes or pride of life," and fasting, alms-deeds, and prayer, are, it is obvious, most judiciously employed as antidotes to neutralize the operation of these three causes of spiritual disease; to the first is opposed fasting; to the second, alms-deeds; to the third, prayer. If, moreover, we consider those whom our sins injure, we shall easily perceive why all satisfaction is referred principally to God, to our neighbor, and to ourselves; God we appease by prayer, our neighbor we satisfy by alms, and ourselves we chastise by fasting.

§ 5. Evangelical Counsels.

From these germs has developed the Romish doctrine of Evangelical Counsels (*consilia evangelica*). By this is meant that there are certain meritorious things which are not *prescribed* as necessary to salvation, but which are *advised* in order to perfection. Thus Romanists speak of voluntary celibacy, poverty, and obedience to ecclesiastical superiors as of this class, in which some number as many as twelve counsels. The "Notes of Difference between Counsels and Commandments Evangelical" are developed by Bishop Jeremy Taylor (*Ductor Dubitantium*, Bk. ii., Chap, iii., Rule 12; Works, Vol. iii., pp. 319, 320):

148

1. When there is no negative expressed or involved, then it cannot be a law; but it is a counsel evangelical. For in every law there is a degree of duty so necessary that every thing less than it is a direct act or state of sin; and, therefore, if the law be affirmative the negative is included, and is the sanction of the main duty, etc.

2. When the action or state is propounded to us only upon the account of reward, and there is no penalty annexed, then it is counsel and no law, for there is no legislative power where there is no coercitive, etc.

3. In counsels sometimes the contrary is very evil: thus, to be industrious and holy, zealous and prudent in the offices ecclesiastical, and to take holy orders in the days of persecution and discouragement, is an instance of love, I doubt not, very pleasing and acceptable to God; and yet he that suffers himself to be discouraged from that particular employment, and to divert to some other instance in which he may well serve God, may remain very innocent or excusable; but those in the primitive Church, who so feared the persecution or the employment that they cut off their thumbs or ears to make themselves canonically incapable, were highly culpable; because he that does an act contrary to the design of counsel evangelical is an enemy to the virtue and the grace of the intendment; he that only lets it alone does not indeed venture for the greater reward, but he may pursue the same virtue in another instance or in a less degree, but yet so as may be accepted, etc.

4. In internal actions there is properly and directly no counsel, but a law only: counsels of perfections are commonly the great and more advantageous prosecutions of an internal grace or virtue; but the inward cannot be hindered by any thing from without, and, therefore, is capable of all increase and all instances only upon the account of love, the greatest degree of which is not greater than the commandment; and yet the least degree, if it be sincere, is even with the commandment, because it is

according to the capacity and greatness of the man.

§ 6. Jeremy Taylor on Luke xvii. 10.

There is a savor of Romish casuistry in Taylor's discussion, as is common in the writings of this learned and subtle prelate. It is more fully disclosed in another part of this chapter, where he brings oat the text alluded to in this article (Luke xvii. 10), and says unguardedly:

> The commandments are made laws to us only by threatenings; for when we shall receive a crown of righteousness in heaven, that is by way of gift merely gratuitous, but the pains of the damned are due to them by their merit and by the measures of justice; and therefore it is remarkable that our blessed Saviour said, "When ye have done all that ye are commanded, ye are unprofitable servants;" that is, the strict measures of the laws or the commandments given to you are such, which if ye do not observe, ye shall die, according to the sentence of the law; but if ye do, "ye are yet unprofitable;" ye have not deserved the good things that are laid up for loving souls; but therefore toward that we must superadd the degrees of progression and growth in grace, the emanations of love and zeal, the methods of perfection and imitation of Christ. For by the first measures we escape hell; but by the progressions of love only, and the increase of duty, through
>
> 149
>
> the mercies of God in Christ, we arrive at heaven. Not that he that escapes hell may, in any case fail of heaven; but that whosoever does obey the commandment in the first and least sense will, in his proportion, grow on toward perfection. For he fails in the first, and does not that worthily, who, if he have time, does not go on to the second? . . . No man must, in the keeping of the commandments of Christ, set himself a limit of duty, "Hitherto will I come, and no further;" for the tree that does not grow is not alive, unless it already have all the growth it can have; and there is in these things thus much of a law—evangelical counsels are thus far necessary, that although in them—that is, in the degrees of duty—there are no certain measures described, yet we are obliged to proceed from beginnings to perfection.

In these two rhetorical passages Taylor teaches that the sanctions of the law are punishments, and not also rewards. But the Scriptures enforce obedience to the law by the latter as well as by the former, and both together constitute the sanctions of the law. "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have

right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city." (Rev. xxii. 14.) "For we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." (*Cf.* Matt. xxv.; Rom. ii. 6–11; Gal. vi. 7, 8; Col. iii. 23–25.) The "reward" is none the less "the gift of God, through Jesus Christ our Lord" (Rom. vi. 23), because it is given as a recognition of obedience to the law, as we have elsewhere shown. (See on Article X.)

To say that doing all the things that are commanded does not deserve a reward, but that the compliance with "evangelical counsels" or "counsels of perfection" does deserve it, comes very near the Romish doctrine *de merito condigno*, and its correlate, *de operibus supererogationis*, against which this article is leveled. Taylor does not, indeed, say with the Romish casuists that these works of supererogation can be transferred to the benefit of others, to commute church censures, to deliver from purgatory, or to purchase heaven for them; but he does teach that these works are "over and above God's commandments," and as such are meritorious. This the article palpably denies.

§ 7. Exposition of Luke xvii. 10.

It may be said that Luke xvii. 10, cited in the article, does not directly prove the point in hand, namely, that voluntary works, besides, over and above God's commandments, may not be performed by us and be rewarded by God, either in our own enhanced

recompense, or in the transfer of their merits to those who need them. But the language is elliptical. It means that God's commandments are so exceedingly broad, and our obedience to them, even if it were perfect, so devoid of any "profit" to him, that it is "arrogancy and impiety" to suppose that we lay him under any obligation by voluntary works, besides, over and above God's commandments. If a perfect obedience to his absolute legislation is, in the sense explained, "unprofitable," *a fortiori*, no voluntary works performed in compliance with mere counsels can have any merit.

§ 8. The Two Great Commandments.

No evangelical counsels, or counsels of perfection, can go beyond the two great commandments of the law. Thus Jesus answered one of the scribes: “The first of all the commandments is, Hear, O Israel; the Lord our God is one Lord: and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength: this is the first commandment. And the second is like, namely this, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. There is none other commandment greater than these. And the scribe said unto him, Well, Master, thou hast said the truth: for there is one God; and there is none other but he: and to love him with all the heart, and with all the understanding, and with all the soul, and with all the strength, and to love his neighbor as himself, is more than all whole burnt-offerings and sacrifices. And when Jesus saw that he answered discreetly, he said unto him. Thou art not far from the kingdom of God.” (Mark xii. 29–34.)

He answered, indeed, discreetly. Surely such a heap of epithets —such emphasis of amplification—excludes the notion that when these two commandments are fulfilled, there shall be any thing left to be done in the way of supererogation, or compliance with fancied evangelical counsels or counsels of perfection: as if there could be any thing more *evangelical* or more *perfect* than such obedience, or as if there were any power of the soul left to be employed in them, or any portion of time unemployed in obeying the “commandments” so that it might be taken up in complying with the “counsels.”

§ 9. No Distinction of Internal and External.

Nor let it be said, as Taylor seems to insinuate, that the commandments

refer, to “internal actions,” “grace, or virtue,” but that the counsels refer to “the external prosecution of the inward grace.” For can any man obey the commandments which require him to love God with all his powers and his neighbor as himself, without “the external prosecution of the inward grace?” As by works faith is made

perfect, so by works love is made perfect, too. “But whoso keepeth his word, in him verily is the love of God perfected.” (1 John ii. 5.) “If ye love me, keep my commandments.” (John xiv. 15.) “For this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments; and his commandments are not grievous.” (1 John v. 3.) “Owe no man any thing, but to love one another: for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law. For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet; and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. Love worketh no ill to his neighbor: therefore love is the fulfilling of the law.” (Rom. xiii. 8–10; *cf.* James ii. 8–12.) It is very true that no “external works” are pleasing and acceptable to God, “unless they spring from love.” But love cannot exist in the heart without development, any more than a fire can continue burning without fuel and vent. But he who thinks he can do something more perfect than that which is done under the impulse of love to God and man, according to the divine commandment, is either *arrogant and impious*, or ignorant and fanatical.

§ 10. Works of Supererogation Impossible.

[Lastly, this teaches that there cannot possibly be any works of supererogation. For, as law is love, love also is law. There can be ho such thing as overpassing the limits of obligation. The spirit of divine charity seems to suppress the terminology of ethics, and to change its character; but only to revive it into higher life. The vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience, so far as they are Christian, are not in reality voluntary vows, but obligatory laws. *Blessed are the poor in spirit! Blessed are the pure in heart! Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness!* are benedictions pronounced upon the three severally, as expressing the true Christian character. Every counsel of perfection is a commandment with promise. . . . Jesus, the universal Lawgiver, is the one Director of souls: “there is one Lawgiver” (Jas. iv. 12), who is God-man, the Lord; and his law is love, whether as to the perfect principle that keeps it, or as to the sum of the commandments which it must keep.[1]]

1. Pope's "Compendium," etc., Vol. III., pp. 184, 185.↩

Chapter II.
Alleged Scriptural Examples Considered.

152

As to the cases of evangelical counsels, or counsels of perfection, usually adduced, and which constitute the groundwork of this doctrine concerning works of supererogation, a few words of explanation will suffice.

§ 1. The Rich Ruler and Voluntary Poverty.

The first case is that of the counsel to voluntary poverty, given by our Lord to the rich ruler, who said he had kept all the commandments of the second table, and asked: “What lack I yet? Jesus said unto him, If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell that thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven; and come and follow me.” (Matt. xix. 20, 21.)

Now, because Christ says, “If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell that thou hast, and give to the poor,” it is thought that he merely gave him a “counsel of perfection,” which, with equal safety, though not with equal merit, he might follow or decline. But does not the sequel show that it was not a counsel which might be followed or not with impunity, but a command, the neglect of which would imperil his salvation? “The young man went away sorrowful; for he had great possessions”—immovable possessions, and hence the command to sell. Christ wished to bring him fully into the kingdom of heaven, and apparently to make him a minister, as in the cases mentioned in Luke ix. 57–62, which cast light upon this case. To do that work it was necessary, under the circumstances, that he should be entirely free from all worldly cares and affections, so that this was not a mere counsel, but a command, which was not only a test of character (which proved too severe in the ruler’s case), but also a prescription of duty preliminary to the work to which he was called. Hence the reply of Peter: “Behold we have forsaken all, and followed thee; what shall we have therefore?” and the well-known reply of our Lord, vs. 27–29. But suppose Peter

and the other apostles had not obeyed the call, “Follow me, and I will make you fishers of men,” what would have been the result? Would they have merely foregone the reward merited by compliance with an “evangelical counsel?” Would they not rather have thereby cut themselves off from all the privileges and promises of the kingdom of heaven, both in this world and in the next? They would thereby have proved themselves not “fit for the kingdom of God.” Admitting that up to that time the ruler was under gracious influence and in the way of salvation, it is questionable whether he could have continued therein after declining the call to the ministry under the influence of undue regard to his worldly possessions. Cornelius was in a state of acceptance before he was visited by Peter; but if he had refused to take the course indicated to him by the apostle, he would have forfeited his standing in the sight of God. It is not sufficient to measure up to the old standard when you are called to a higher grade.

[Upon the case of the rich ruler, Pope remarks:

The specific dogma that the counsels of perfection test the character of believers and stimulate them to a higher attainment is an unscriptural one, so far as it introduces a new element in probation. It will be urged that our Lord himself applied these as tests during his personal administration of his kingdom. But it must be remembered that he used these tests under special circumstances; that, strictly speaking, he never applied but one of the counsels, that of renunciation of property; and that, in the application of this, he only laid down a principle of universal importance, with a specific reference to the need of a particular case. He never used tests of probation which should distinguish one class of his disciples from another in all ages. Hence the doctrine and practice of Romanism as the chief representative of the sacramentarian system, and that of merit resulting from obedience to counsels, in two ways interfere with the reality of probation: first, by taking away to some extent the probationary responsibility of the believer; and, secondly, by applying a superfluous and limited test. Probation is in Christianity the same for all and for all alike.1

Chastity, poverty, and obedience are the three-one estate of perfection, as exemplified by our Lord himself, to which, it has been assumed, he called the more elect among his followers. But our Lord did not summon some men to a perfection denied to others, though he did summon some men to duties not required in all cases of others. To all his disciples the injunction came to aspire to another three-one perfection: “If any man will come after me let him deny himself, and take up his cross daily and follow me.” (Luke ix. 23.) These three are imposed on every Christian, without

exception.2]

§ 2. Christian Communism.

The case of the primitive Christians who “sold their possessions,”

154

and for awhile “had all things common,” is not parallel to the case of the ruler, or what was required of him, as it does not appear that there was any command of God or counsel of the apostles so to do. It seems to have taken place under the promptings of an extraordinary impulse of enthusiasm, which was a law unto itself. It was obligatory upon none at the time, as Peter reminded Ananias, and it was no precedent for subsequent times. (Acts iv.–v.) Ignorance and fanaticism have adduced it in favor of the community of goods, which is condemned in our Twenty-fourth Article. The outward manifestations of love to God and our neighbor, and in particular “brotherly love,” vary greatly in mode and degree, according to the circumstances in which men are placed and the peculiar character of each. No specific commands or counsels are given, or can be given. Zeal and liberality are inculcated by the highest considerations and in the most imperative manner. But sumptuary laws, tithe laws, vows of poverty, and the like, are foreign to the genius of the Christian dispensation. Make all you can by industry; save all you can by economy; give all you can by liberality, are the best rules we know. It is left to every man’s own reason and conscience, enlightened and influenced by the Holy Spirit, to carry them into practice. Some lay up more treasure in heaven than others, and every man shall receive his own reward according to his own labor. “For God is not unrighteous to forget your work and labor of love, which ye have showed toward his name, in that ye have ministered to the saints, and do minister.” (Heb. vi. 10; *cf.* Matt. x. 42; xxv. 34–40; Heb. xiii. 16; 1 John iii. 16–18.)

§ 3. Celibacy.

The next case adduced is that of celibacy. It is supposed that

the apostle meant it, not as a commandment, but as a "counsel of perfection," when he wrote to the Corinthians: "It is good for a man not to touch a woman. . . . For I would that all men were even as I myself. But every man hath his proper gift of God, one after this manner, and another after that. I say therefore to the unmarried and widows. It is good for them if they abide even as I. . . . I suppose, therefore, that this is good for the present distress; I say that it is good for a man so to be. . . . So, then, he that giveth her in marriage doeth well, but he that giveth her not in marriage doeth better." (1 Cor. vii.)

155

We have elsewhere shown (under Article V.) that the apostle does not speak here of his own proper motion, but, as everywhere else, by inspiration, so that whether you call his instructions commands or counsels, they are all of divine authority. It is usual to collate with these passages Matt. xix. 10–12, where the disciples, demurring to Christ's inhibition of divorce, except for one cause, say to him: "If the case of a man be so with his wife, it is not good to marry. But he said unto them, All men cannot receive this saying, save they to whom it is given. For there are some eunuchs which were so born from their mother's womb; and there are some eunuchs which were made eunuchs of men; and there be eunuchs which have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake. He that is able to receive it, let him receive it."

The sum of all this is that marriage and celibacy are alike good, according to circumstances and particular persons. For some, as the apostle says, it is better to marry, and marriage is honorable in all who properly enter that state, and the bed undefiled. For others it is better to remain unmarried, namely, those who have the gift of continence and have special evangelistic duties to perform, which can be performed better by celibates than by married persons—especially in times of distress. By "the present distress," it is generally held that the apostle means the times of persecution through which the primitive Christians were passing, though Bishop Browne and some others think he means the ordinary troubles and afflictions of life. But surely it can hardly be said that celibacy is, in itself, a more desirable state than matrimony, in which are found, it may be, greater cares, but also far greater solaces and joys. Celibacy is usually spoken of in the Scriptures as a far inferior state to matrimony; and therefore it seems clear that both our Lord and his

apostles commend it in the cases specified simply for the reasons we have assigned. But, in every case, the adoption of this state of life is left to the judgment and conscience of every one, enlightened by the Holy Spirit, and the indications of divine providence.

§ 4. Paul and Ministerial Compensation.

The fourth case adduced is that of Paul in 1 Cor. ix. 15, where the apostle says that he had a right to claim compensation from the Corinthians for his ministerial services. "But," says he, "I

have used none of these things; neither have I written these things, that it should be so done unto me; for it were better for me to die, than that any man should make my glorying void." It is strange that any one should stumble at this passage or misunderstand its drift. The apostle simply means that while he had a right to receive pay for his services, he relinquished it, in this particular case (though not in others), because his enemies were ready to charge him with sinister motives in preaching the gospel. This was agreeable to his usual course, to make himself all things to all men, that he might by all means save some. "For," says he, "though I be free from all men, yet have I made myself servant unto all, that I might gain the more." (1 Cor. ix. 19, 20.)

It is not denied that the apostle would receive a reward for his disinterestedness; but he says nothing of that in this passage, which the Vulgate incorrectly renders, *quam ut gloriam meam quis evacuet.* St. Augustin, who knew but little Greek, and who used the Latin version, says, *Quam gloriam? nisi quam habere voluit apud Deum in Christo.* "What glory? if not that which he wished to have before God in Christ." Bellarmin argues from this that Paul would not take pay for his preaching to the Corinthians, in order that he might have greater glory for so doing. There is a sense in which this might be the case. A man may forego earthly advantages to gain a greater heavenly reward. But Paul does not here use the word *δόξα*, glory, but *καύχημα*, boasting. He does not refer to any glory which he looked for in heaven, but to the laudable boasting to which he was entitled for his disinterestedness in serving the Corinthians without pay. It is strange that such a passage as this should be pressed into the service of the merit of condignity and works of supererogation.

§ 5. Degrees in Excellency.

If it be asked how those will fare who do not always choose "the things that are excellent," who do not perform all the services, and make all the sacrifices which they might do, to the greater glory of God and the good of man, we may simply reply that this question, however pertinent in other connections, has nothing to do with the present discussion. If those who fulfill their whole duty in every particular, and who may expect a full reward, an entrance ministered unto them abundantly into the

157

everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, are still unprofitable servants of the great Master, so that they may not glory, or boast, in the presence of God (1 Cor. i. 29), those who do not thus excel in piety and virtue have little reason to speak of merit as for themselves, to say nothing of an overplus which they might transfer to others! (See Wesley's sermon on "The More Excellent Way.") The relation which works of supererogation bear to the popish notions of purgatory, pardons, and the like will be seen in the discussion of the Fourteenth Article.

§ 6. Möhler's Doctrine Reviewed.

[Perhaps the ablest and most learned of modern Roman Catholic divines is the deservedly eminent German theologian, Möhler, whose statement of what he himself calls the "remarkable doctrine" of supererogation is thus quoted by Pope:

> Some men of late have defended the old orthodox Lutheran doctrine, by assuring us that the moral law proposes to men an ideal standard, which, like every thing ideal, necessarily continues unattained. If such really be the case with the moral law, then he who comes not up to its requirements can as little incur responsibility as an epic poet for not equaling the Iliad. More rational, at least, is the theory that the higher a believer stands in the scale of morality the more exalted are the claims of the moral law upon him: so that they increase, as it were, to infinity with the internal growth of man, and leave him ever behind them. Now, when we contemplate the lives of the saints the opposite phenomena strike our attention. The consciousness of being in the possession of an all-sufficing, infinite power discloses more and more the tenderer and nobler relations of

man to God and to his fellow-creatures; so that the sanctified in Christ, filled with his Spirit, ever feels himself superior to the law. It is the nature of heaven-born love, which stands so infinitely far above the claims of the mere law, never to be content with its own doings, and ever to be more ingenious in its own devices; so that Christians of this stamp not unfrequently seem to others of a lower grade of perfection to be enthusiasts, or men of distempered mind. Only in this way that remarkable doctrine can be satisfactorily explained—which, like every other that has for ages existed and seriously engaged the human mind, is sure to rest on some sure foundation—the doctrine, namely, that there can be works which are more than sufficient (*opera supererogationis*), the tendency and delicacy of which eluded the perception of the Reformers.

It is noteworthy that even in this attempted philosophy of "works more than sufficient," in which scriptural proofs are conspicuously absent, though probably cited elsewhere, Möhler concedes a point of view which is fatal to his position, namely, that the claims of the moral law may increase, with the believer's

spiritual growth, to infinity, leaving the most exalted saint ever behind them. But let us hear Dr. Pope's refutation:

If this doctrine meant only that love in the regenerate soul aspires to a perfection which cannot be measured by the standard of any positive precepts it would be unimpeachable: so stated, it would be only another form of the Lutheran and Calvinistic assertion that the external law is abrogated in Christ, being exchanged for the internal law, by which believers may render obedience in a higher and nobler spirit. All that is noble in the theory of supererogatory works is maintained by all sound Protestants; but they make it consistent with the evangelical covenant by declaring that no such works can be above the requirements of the law interpreted by love; that even these are accepted as wrought by the believer, because their imperfection is constantly forgiven for the sake of the atonement, and that their absolute merit is utterly excluded by our Lord when he bids such as are supposed to have performed them call themselves unprofitable servants, who have done only that which it was their duty to do. The attempt to separate between law and love is a hopeless one: love is said to be the fulfilling of the law, and in maintaining that everlasting principle against their opponents the Romanist divines had scripture on their side; but in establishing it as a higher standard than the moral law which it only interprets, and in linking it with special and arbitrary counsels which are made into statutory laws binding on a particular class, and, above all, in assigning specific merit—the merit of satisfaction—to the acts of this estate of perfection, they are contradicted by the spirit and the letter of the entire New Testament.[3]]

1. Pope, “Compendium,” etc., Vol. III., pp. 110, 111.↩
2. *Ibid.*, p. 66.↩
3. Pope, “Compendium,” etc., Vol. III., pp. 81, 82.↩

Part VI.

Article XII.
Of Sin After Justification.

159

Not every sin willingly committed after justification is the sin against the Holy Ghost, and unpardonaUe. Wherefore, the grant of repentance is not to be denied to such as fall into sin after justification: after we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from grace given, and fall into sin, and, by the grace of God, rise again and amend our lives. And therefore they are to be condemned who say they can no more sin as long as they live here, or deny the place of forgiveness to such as truly repent.

Introduction.

This article was taken substantially from the Twelfth Article of the Augsburg Confession, "Of Repentance," the latter part of which reads thus:

> They condemn the doctrine of such as deny [in the Latin recension, *Damnant Anabaptistas*] that those who have been justified may lose the Holy Spirit. In like manner those who contend that some persons attain so high a degree of perfection in this life, that they cannot sin. They reject also those [in the Latin, *Damnantur et Novatiani*] who are unwilling to absolve such as have backslidden after baptism, even if they repent; as also those who teach that remission of sins is not obtained through faith, but require us to merit grace by our good works.

This article is nearly the same as the Fifteenth Article of the Confession of 1552, in which the Sixteenth Article developed the subject, treating expressly of blasphemy against the Holy Ghost. It is the Sixteenth Article of the present Anglican Confession. It has been subjected to some verbal changes. Burnet informs us that in the MS. original, signed by both Houses of Convocation, and preserved in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, the reading is, "the place for penitence," instead of "the grant of repentance." Burnet, in the New York edition, has "*the* sin against the Holy Ghost," as ours; but the word "the" before

sin is omitted in all the other editions of the Articles which we have seen. In some old editions the words “we may,” before the word “arise,” are put in parentheses. Wesley has simply “rise again.” He has also “who say” for “which say.”

But our article has another change more suggestive, and an omission more important.

Instead of saying in the title, “Of Sin after Baptism,” our Article says, “Of Sin after Justification;” and it omits the word “deadly” before “sin.”

[These judicious changes of Mr. Wesley’s will be immediately explained and justified at length.]

Chapter I.
Mr. Wesley's Changes Explained and Justified.

§ 1. The Substitution of Justification for Baptism.

161
The Reformers used the word baptism because they held, however inconsistently, to the patristic notion of baptismal justification and regeneration. The Fathers taught that all sins, original and actual, were remitted in baptism. It is easy to account for this opinion. When the gospel was first preached, and Jews or Gentiles embraced the message of salvation through Jesus as the promised Messiah, they were baptized for the remission of their sins, baptism being the exponent of their faith, and the rite by which they confessed the same. It was natural, therefore, to attribute to baptism the virtue which belonged to the faith of which it was the exponent and the grace of the Holy Spirit of which it was the symbol and pledge—not to say, that in some cases, the outward rite assisted in the exercise of faith, and so was a means whereby the grace signified was realized.

But as afterward the subjects of baptism were mostly children, who are incapable of faith, and of whom justification cannot be predicated, as they are not actually transgressors, and so have no personal sins to be forgiven, it is misleading to identify justification with baptism. It is only in very rare cases, as we showed in discussing the Ninth Article, on Justification, that the baptism of an adult and his initial exercise of justifying faith, are synchronous. Mr. Wesley, therefore, did well to substitute "justification" for "baptism" in the title and in the body of this article. Many would have misgivings in subscribing the article in its original form; but none can hesitate in subscribing it as we have it.

§ 2. The Romish Distinction Between Mortal and Venial Sins.

The same may be said in regard to the omission of the word "deadly" before "sin." The Reformers might not have had in

view the Romish distinction between deadly sins and venial sins; but the use of the word "deadly"—in the Latin recension *mortale*—seems to look that way.

Romanists hold that there are seven sins which are so heinous that they are called deadly, or mortal sins, namely: murder, lust, covetousness, gluttony, pride, envy, and idleness. Any one of these sins, it is said, forfeits the grace of God, because it is in its nature gross, and is committed knowingly, willfully, and deliberately. On the contrary, venial sins, that is, sins which are pardonable, are small in their nature, and are committed through ignorance or negligence. Holy persons, they say, fall daily into these sins, which do not exclude the transgressor from the grace of God; and Bellarmin says no amount of venial sins can make a mortal sin. Mortal and venial sins, therefore, according to Roman casuists, differ not only in enormity, but also in nature.

This distinction is not only absurd and unscriptural, but is very mischievous. Apply our Lord's test in regard to the first three of the so-called mortal sins, and see if he does not comprehend under murder, lust, and covetousness a multitude of sins which Romish casuists would call venial. The most subtle casuist has never been able to draw the line of demarkation between so-called mortal and venial sins.

But it is said the word "deadly" was used by the Reformers in this place as in the Litany: "From fornication, and all ether deadly sins," to denote, as Burnet says, "those sins only that do deeply wound the conscience, and that drive away grace," whereas, he says, "we acknowledge that some sins of ignorance and infirmity may consist with a state of grace." The difference between this view and that of the Romanists will appear to common people as about the same as the difference between *tweedledum* and *tweedledee!* The truth is, every sin is in its nature deadly, and every sin upon repentance is venial; so the distinction is without a difference. Hence Mr. Wesley did well to omit the ambiguous word. As was said in the former case, so we say in this: Many would have misgivings in subscribing the article in its original form, but none can hesitate in subscribing it as we have it. *A fortiori*, if "deadly" sins are pardonable, all other sins may be forgiven.

§3. The Sin Against the Holy Ghost.

There is, however, a qualification which must be noted: "Not
163
every sin *willingly* committed after justification is the sin against the Holy Ghost, and unpardonable." In one sense all sinful acts are willingly performed; it is indeed the will which makes the sin. But in this place "willingly"—in the Latin *voluntarie*—means "willfully," as ἑκουσίως rendered in Heb. x. 26; in the Vulgate, *voluntarie*: "If we sin willfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sin." Wycliffe and Cranmer both render "willfully," but Tyndale, Geneva, Rheims, and L. Tomson (1599) all have "willingly," as the same word is rendered in our version of 1 Peter v. 2, where it is used in a good sense, as in Heb. x. 26 it is used in a bad sense. The note in Tomson's "Beza" is: "Without any cause or occasion, or show of occasion."

The schoolmen speak of sins of infirmity—these are against the Father especially, as his peculiar personal attribute is power; sins of ignorance, especially against the Son, whose peculiar attribute is wisdom; and sins of presumption, especially against the Spirit, whose peculiar attribute is love. In this last class are placed willful sins. But not all of these are such sins against the Holy Ghost as are unpardonable.

That which is considered by eminence the sin against the Holy Ghost is that which is called in the Gospels "the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit," which we learn from Mark iii. 22–30, consisted in attributing the miracles which Jesus wrought by the power of the Holy Spirit to Beelzebub, the prince of the devils. Some say "the scribes" did not commit this sin, but were in danger of doing so, hence Christ warned them of the consequences, to keep them from it. They say that that sin could not be committed, because the Holy Ghost was not yet given. How strange that they should overlook the fact that the Holy Spirit came upon Christ in his baptism, and remained during the whole course of his ministry, and that by his power Christ performed the miracles which authenticated his mission. The scribes did say that Christ wrought his miracles by the power of the devil; and Mark says that he uttered the fearful sentence concerning the unpardonable sin, "Because they said, He hath an unclean spirit." This blasphemy therefore does not consist in final impenitence, for every sin unrepented of is unpardonable, but it consists of blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, that is, such detraction as has the Holy Spirit

for its object—not speaking against the divinity or dignity of his person, or of his ordinary operations, but against the highest and most important and most obvious manifestations of his econominal functions, by which the divine legation of Jesus was authenticated, and the divine original of Christianity ratified. This argued a malignity so deep and damning that repentance and pardon were out of the question. It could not be reasonably expected that those who had arrived at such a pitch of depravity as to sin so malignantly and so presumptuously would in the future do what they had failed to do in the past—yield to those influences by which men are brought to repentance and pardon. So it is said of those who are long accustomed to sin, it is impossible for them to reform their lives. “Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots? then may ye also do good, that are accustomed to do evil.” (Jer. xiii. 23.) Yet the impossibility, in the case of the habitual sinner, is not a proper, philosophical impossibility, as in that of the Ethiopian or leopard. Habitual sinners—those who have grown old in crime—may repent; though, generally speaking, they never do, and it is morally impossible that they should. The apostasy spoken of (Heb. vi. 4–6; x. 26–30) does not appear to be identical with the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, though it bears an affinity to it. That apostasy consists in a deliberate rejection of Christianity, after having experienced its saving power. It is not likely that such men will be induced to give up their malignant opposition to Christianity; yet it is perhaps going too far to say that this is absolutely and philosophically impossible.

Bishop Burnet, however, says of the blasphemy of the scribes, with great show of reason:

> This is an impious rejection of the highest method that God himself uses for proving a thing to us. The scorn put upon it, as it flows from a nature so depraved that it cannot be wrought on, so it is a sin not to be pardoned. All things of extreme severity in a doctrine that is so full of grace and mercy as the gospel is ought to be restrained as much as may be. From thence we infer that those dreadful words of our Saviour’s ought to be restrained to the subject to which, they are applied, and ought not to be carried further. Since miracles have ceased no man is any more capable of this sin.

Chapter II.
Novatianism.

165
The article is leveled first against Novatianism.

§ 1. Historical.

The Novatians were the followers of Novatian in the third century. He was a presbyter at Rome, and caused himself to be consecrated by three Bishops of Italy, Bishop of Rome, as the rival of Cornelius, who had been already consecrated Bishop of that see. Novatian thought that Cornelius was too lenient toward the lapsed, or those who apostatized in time of persecution and sought reconciliation to the Church. The claims of the two rivals were submitted to Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, who declared in favor of Cornelius; thereupon Novatian formed a new sect, called Cathari, or Puritans. They affected superior sanctity, and refused to re-admit apostates to the Church, and even denied that God could pardon them. They were excommunicated by a Council at Rome, and the First Council of Antioch was summoned against them. Nevertheless, they spread all over the Western Church and over large portions of the Eastern Church—Alexandria, Constantinople, and several provinces of Asia, particularly Phrygia and Paphlagonia. They were persecuted by Constantine, who interdicted their assembling for worship, confiscated their churches, and banished their leaders. They subsequently relaxed somewhat their rigorous discipline, and by the middle of the fifth century were reduced to an inconsiderable party.

§ 2. Critical Examination of Heb. vi. 4–6.

They grounded their views principally upon a misinterpretation of Heb. vi. 4–6 and Heb. x. 26–31. In Heb. vi. the apostle says, as in our Authorized Version: “For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were

made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to

come, if they shall fall away, to renew them again unto repentance, seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame."

This passage would not have been so variously interpreted and so grossly perverted if the scope and design of the author and the context had been duly regarded. The epistle is directed to Christian Jews, and is a logical dissuasion from apostasy, into which some of their brethren had fallen, and of which they were in danger. The great argument which the writer uses, and principally enforces, is the vast superiority of the Christian to the Jewish dispensation, its Author being superior to angels, by whose agency the Jewish dispensation was given, and to Moses, its mediator, and to the Levitical priests, who were its ministers. On this last point, he was about to show that the priesthood of Jesus had for its type the royal priesthood of Melchizedec; but at this point (Chap. v. 11) he goes off, according to his manner, into a parenthesis, or episode, in which he reproves them for their dullness, but expresses a good hope concerning them, inasmuch as they still continued faithful, while others had apostatized. He was thus encouraged to give them further instruction in the doctrine of Christ to carry them forward to perfection, while it was impossible to do any thing more for those who had totally renounced the Christian faith. This episode continues from Chap. v. 11 to Chap. vi. 20, when the mention of Melchizedec brings him back to the subject from which he had digressed.

As if he had said, "Dull as you are—mere children in knowledge, when you ought to be men—yet we will bear with you and give you further instruction, provided you do not apostatize, like some of your brethren, to whom we can be of no further service: for as to those who were enlightened with the truth of the gospel, and who experienced the heavenly blessing of divine grace, and were made partakers of the spiritual gifts imparted by the Holy Ghost, and who realized the exceeding great and precious promises which God has spoken, and the miraculous influences which attended the Christian dispensation, and yet fell away, it is impossible to place them where they were when by repentance they were constituted disciples of Christ, seeing, as far as they are

concerned, they virtually crucify the Son of God and stigmatize him as an imposter. We can bestow no

more labor on them, because they are like land which has been thoroughly cultivated, and yet produces nothing but thorns and briers, which are of course rejected by the husbandman as utterly worthless. He puts no plow, he casts no seed, into such soil. But you, beloved, are not of this class. Though you have not made as much improvement as you ought to have done and as we expected from you, yet your attachment to Christ and his saints encourages us to labor for your improvement and salvation; so be not slothful, but followers of them who through faith and patience inherit the promises—especially Abraham; hold fast to the Christian hope (while others let it go), as it is a sure anchor cast within the veil, whither the forerunner is for us entered, even Jesus made a High-priest forever, after the order of Melchizedec."

He then goes on to expatiate upon the royal and unchangeable priesthood of Christ, as the great Antitype of Melchizedec.

In this simple view of the subject it is clear that the passage has nothing whatever to do with the question concerning the reception or rejection of repentant apostates. That a change might take place in them under the influence of the Holy Spirit is neither affirmed nor denied; the scope of the argument has nothing to do with that. If they came to a better mind, which was very improbable—though it does not appear to have been impossible—and applied to the apostle for further instruction, we may be sure he would not have refused to impart it, nor would the apostolic Church have refused to restore them to its communion. Jeremiah said to the stubborn Jews of his time: "Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots? then may ye also do good, that are accustomed to do evil." He illustrates a moral by a natural impossibility. Yet the prophet did not wholly despair of their coming to a better mind, as appears from his reproofs, warnings, threatenings, aud promises. (Jer. xiii.) So Christ said, "It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God." And the disciples were astonished out of measure, saying among themselves, "Who then can be saved?" And Jesus looking upon them, saith, "With men it is impossible, but not with God; for with God all things are possible." He means, of course, all things not inconsistent with the perfections of God or the moral agency of

man. As it regards mere human

power, salvation is impossible—really so with the case of every man, emphatically so in the case of the rich man; but the grace of God will enable him to overcome the difficulties in the way of his salvation; it can enable him to consecrate his wealth, though retaining the possession of his estate, to the glory of God, so that instead of hindering it shall promote his salvation. These cases illustrate the point in hand.

§ 3. Critical Examination of Heb. x. 26–31.

The other passage, Heb. x. 26–31, reads thus: "For if we sin willfully, after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries. He that despised Moses's law died without mercy, under two or three witnesses. Of how much surer punishment suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace? For we know him that hath said, Vengeance belongeth unto me, I will recompense, saith the Lord; and again, The Lord will judge his people. It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God."

This is an appalling passage. It is of the same general import as that in Heb. vi.; but still there is a difference. The sin in question is the same—apostasy. Those who committed it had received the knowledge of the truth, corresponding to those "who were once enlightened" in Heb. vi.; and they had been sanctified by the blood of the covenant—that is, the blood of Christ, which ratified the new and everlasting covenant. (*Cf.* Heb. xiii. 20; ix. 13–22; x. 14–22.) Their sin was not one of ignorance, for they had received the knowledge of the truth; nor was it one of infirmity, because they had been sanctified by the blood of Christ applied to their hearts by the Spirit of grace; but it was willful—that is, presumptuous—alluding perhaps to Num. xv. 30, 31; Deut. xiii. Stuart says: "Εκουσίως means, then, deliberately, with forethought, with settled intention or design, and not by merely sadden and violent impulse

or by oversight." The sin was not only presumptuous, but it was a total revolt from Christianity; it tore up the very foundations; it degraded the Author of Christianity to the level of a base impostor, and insulted

the Holy Spirit, by whom this gracious economy of salvation is administered, as if he were a party to a grand imposture! If this is not the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, it is near akin to it. Those who thus apostatize from Christianity surely cannot be saved by it; and as there is no other way of salvation (Acts iv. 12; Mark xvi. 16; Heb. ii. 1–4), no other sacrifice for sin, but that which Christianity sets forth, their damnation is sure. Whatever might be the fate of those who never knew the way of salvation by Jesus Christ, it is very certain that none who have known it and yet deliberately reject it can possibly be saved. This does not, however, argue that while they are still on the earth they may not return to the faith and be saved. It is not likely that such aggravated sinners ever will repent of their apostasy, but it plainly affirms that they will be damned if they incorrigibly continue in it.

But what has all this to do with Novatianism? Nothing whatever. Neither of these passages affirms that apostates are incapable by God's grace to repent of their apostasy; and neither precludes them, if penitent, from the mercy of God or the communion of the Church. And if these do not, Novatian may look in vain to other passages for any support for his revolting opinion.

§ 4. The Ante-Nicene Church.

The students of ecclesiastical history may be somewhat puzzled by the near approach of the Ante-Nicene Church to Novatianism. The early Fathers were very rigid in their penitentiary system. They kept gross offenders, however penitent, out of the Church for many years—in some cases till just before death—and indeed refused reconciliation, even then, to those who had not by a proper length of time demonstrated the sincerity of their repentance. Hence, they have been charged with Novatianism. Socrates, the historian, says Asclepiades, the Novatian Bishop, argued this question with Atticus, the Catholic Bishop of Constantinople. When Atticus said that communion might be denied even at the point of death to such as

had sacrificed to idols, and that he himself had sometimes done so, Asclepiades replied: “There are many other sins unto death, as the Scripture calls them, besides sacrificing to idols, for which you shut the clergy out of the Church; and we the laity, remitting them over to God alone for their pardon.” Novatian, indeed, denied

that *God* would pardon such willful offenders. But the difference between the Catholics and the Novatians was this: though they frequently agreed in their practice, yet they differed in their principles; the Catholics asserted that the clergy had the power of the keys, in the exercise of which they could bind and loose the greatest offenders, excluding them for a greater or a shorter period, or forever, from the communion of the Church, or reconciling them, being penitent, at their discretion; whereas the Novatians denied that they had the power to loose such offenders though they had the power to bind them.

The later Novatians, indeed, like the Catholics, admitted that God might forgive the penitent offenders, upon their repentance—thus admitting the possibility of their repenting. But both Catholics and Novatians were inconsistent in this, that they held that whatsoever they bound or loosed on earth was bound or loosed in heaven: if this were the case, then, if the Church denied pardon to a penitent, how could they expect God to pardon him?

§ 5. Testimony of Scripture.

According to the testimony of the Scriptures the greatest sinners have been promptly pardoned by God and restored to the communion of the Church, and even to the ministry, upon their repentance. God pardons them as soon as they repent, and the Church restores them as soon as they have given credible evidence of their repentance, and submitted to the disciplinary censure long enough to prevent scandal by their restoration.

How speedily were David and Peter pardoned, upon their penitence, and restored to their official standing in the Church! Thus David prayed: “Restore unto me the joy of thy salvation; and uphold me with thy free Spirit. Then will I teach transgressors thy way, and sinners shall be converted unto thee.” “Deliver me from blood guiltiness, O God, thou God of my salvation; and my tongue

shall sing aloud of thy righteousness." (Ps. li. 12, 13, 14.) Peter wept bitterly over his apostasy, and how soon is he restored to his apostleship!

The incestuous Corinthian is delivered over to Satan—not to be damned, but subjected to severe disciplinary punishment; but on his deep and manifest repentance he is speedily restored to the communion, of the Church. God forgave him, and the Church did not dare to withhold its forgiveness. "Sufficient to

such a man," says the apostle, "is this punishment, which was inflicted of many." (1 Cor. v.; 2 Cor. ii.)

Paul speaks of some "who concerning faith have made shipwreck: of whom is Hymeneus and Alexander; whom," says he, "I have delivered unto Satan"—that is, expelled from the Church, as all outside were considered under the power of Satan, the god of this world—not that they might continne in that state and be finally damned, but "that they may learn not to blaspheme." (1 Tim. i. 19, 20.) All Church censures, except in extreme cases, like those of Ananias and Sapphira, should have in view the salvation of the offender as well as the purity of the Church and the honor of its exalted Head.

§ 6. Ancient and Modern Tendencies toward Novatianism.

Novatus, a presbyter of Carthage, is sometimes cited as one of the founders of the Novatian sect. At first, he opposed the strictness of his Bishop, Cyprian; but when he went to Rome he joined the Novatians, "although," says Kurtz ("Church History," p. 134), "his own views of ecclesiastical discipline had been the very opposite to theirs, and incited them to separation."

The Donatists in the fourth century adopted the leading opinion of the Novatians, and contended against the Catholics that the true Church is composed exclusively of holy persons, thus confounding the visible with the invisible Church, forgetting that the tares and wheat grow together in the former until the time of harvest. The Catholics held that a prudent discipline should be exercised to keep the Church pure, but that it does not cease to be a true Church because it contains unholy members.

As before the times of Novatian and Donatas, so subsequently,

down to even our times, there has been a strong leaning, even in catholic, orthodox Churches, toward Novatianism. But many heretical and schismatical sects have been distinguished for their maintenance of this error—*e. g.*, the Apostolici, Meletians, Luciferians, and others. Dr. Hey thinks that the Lutheran and Anglican Reformers had chiefly in view the Anabaptists, in their condemnation of this extreme rigor against the lapsed. We have already cited the condemnation of Novatianism in the Augsburg Confession. The Fourteenth Article of the Helvetic Confession declares: "There is access to God and pardon for

all who believe, except those who sin against the Holy Ghost; therefore the Old and New Novatians and Cathari are to be condemned." By the New Novatians and Cathari they seem to refer to the Anabaptists.

The English homilies echo the language of the article, and assure forgiveness to every sinner of "all actual sin committed after baptism, if he truly repent and turn to God." "Repentance is never too late, so that it is true and just."

We conclude this discussion with a pregnant passage from Dr. Knapp ("Christian Theology," Sec. 113., p. 398):

> Even those, who after their reformation and the bestowment of forgiveness fall away and transgress anew, may again obtain the forgiveness of their sins as soon as they repent and believe in Christ. So the Bible everywhere teaches, both in the Old and New Testament. (Ezek. xxxiii. 11; 1 Thess. v. 9.) Christ commands us to be forgiving to our neighbor who has wronged us, since in this we shall resemble God, who is easily reconciled, and who willingly forgives sin. Therefore the precept (Matt. xviii. 21, 22) is applicable to God. This position is confirmed by the examples of many apostates in the Bible, who, after the commission of great offenses, were again received into favor—*e. g.*, David (2 Sam. xii.) and Peter (Matt. xxvi.). The condition of repentance and faith, however, is indispensable.

Chapter III.
The Dogma of Inamissible Grace Refuted.

173
This article is next leveled against those who hold to the inamissibility of grace.

§ 1. Historical.

As we have seen, this error was broached by the Anabaptists at the time of the Reformation, the Twelfth Article of the Augsburg Confession attributing it to the Anabaptists, by name, in the Latin recension—"the Anabaptists, who deny that those who have been justified may lose the Holy Spirit."

Calvin and his followers so far agreed with the Anabaptists as to deny that the elect, after receiving justifying grace, can ever lose it; but they did not go so far as to say that "they can no more sin while they live here." The elect, after their justification and regeneration, may sin foully, but not so as quite to vacate the grace of God or to imperil their final salvation. The Calvinistic party in the Church of England, as might be supposed, were not satisfied with this article, which affirms that "after we have received the Holy Ghost we may depart from grace given and fall into sin," and implies that the fall may be total and final. Hence they wanted King James to order that the following clause should be added: "yet neither totally nor finally." But the petition was not granted.

An attempt had been previously made to foist in the same error in the Fifth of the Lambeth Articles, which read thus:

> The true, lively, and justifying faith, and the Spirit of God justifying, is not extinguished, doth not utterly fail, doth not vanish away in the elect, either finally or totally.

But this Calvinistic Confession was also repudiated, though framed by Archbishop Whitgift. Hook says:

> There can be no greater proof of the absence of Calvinism from the Thirty-nine Articles than the fact that the very persons who were condemning the orthodox for innovation, were compelled to invent new articles before they could make our Church Calvinistic. The conduct of the

pious persons, and especially to the Queen; and this attempt to introduce Calvinism into our Church entirely failed.

It was introduced, however, into all the Reformed (or Presbyterian) Churches on the Continent and in Great Britain and Ireland; and, further, it was ingrafted into the various Confessions of the Independents, or Congregationalists, and most of the Baptist Confessions—where it is still retained. Even the Cumberland Presbyterians, who reject the decree of unconditional predestination, indorse the dogma of inamissible grace, though their Predestination brethren say they are inconsistent in so doing, because, if they renounce the covenant of election, they ought to renounce the dogma of unconditional perseverance, which is merely its corollary, election being, as they say, the basis of perseverance.

The dogma of inamissible grace, like that of absolute predestination, was unknown to the Church before the time of the Pelagian controversy, when it was propounded by Augustin. Indeed, to speak properly, Augustin did not believe in the inamissibility of grace. He positively and repeatedly asserts that many do fall from a state of grace—from justification and regeneration—into sin, totally and finally. But he held that some of the saints were predestinated to persevere finally; or at least, if they fell, to be restored before they died, so that their eternal salvation was absolutely secured by the decree of election. He says:

> It is much to he admired, and admired again, that God, to some of his children whom he hath regenerated in Christ, and to whom he hath given faith, hope, and love, should not give perseverance; whereas he forgives such great sins unto strange children, and, by imparting his grace unto them, makes them children of his own.

And again:

> For of such we dispute, who want perseverance in goodness and go out of the world by death, with the goodness of their wills fallen from good to evil. Let these men answer, if they can, why God did not take away such men from the danger of life, while they yet lived faithfully and religiously, that so sin and wickedness might not have changed their minds.

Many more passages of the same complexion may be found cited from Augustin's works, the original Latin being given, in the fourteenth chapter of Goodwin's "Redemption Redeemed," in which immortal work the dogma of inamissible grace is shivered to atoms.

Luther was at first a great admirer of Augustin, and embraced his predestinarian theory; but he afterward relaxed his sentiments, and in particular taught that saints may and sometimes do fall from grace totally and finally. In his work on Galatians he says: “The righteousness of the law, which Paul here calls the flesh, is so far from justifying men that they, who after they have received the Spirit by the hearing of faith, make a defection unto it, are consummated by it”—*i. e.*, are made an end of and destroyed utterly. On these words “Ye are fallen from grace,” he says: “Ye are no longer in the kingdom of grace. He that falleth from grace simply loseth expiation, remission of sins, righteousness, liberty, and that life which Christ by his death and resurrection has merited for us.”

Melancthon is still more explicit than Luther, as he wrote against the Anabaptist fanatics who broached the doctrine condemned in this article. He says: “These are but errors of fanatic men, which must briefly be confuted, who conceit that men regenerated cannot lapse, and that though they do fall, and this against the light of their conscience, yet they are righteous” or in a state of justification. He continues: “This madness is to be condemned, and both instances aud sayings from the scriptures of the apostles and prophets are opposed to it. Saul and David pleased God, were righteous, had the Holy Ghost given unto them, yet afterward fell, so that one of them perished utterly; the other returned again to God. There are many sayings to the same point.” And having cited to the point in hand Matt. xii. 43, 44; 2 Pet, ii. 20, 21; 1. Cor. x. 12; Rev. ii. 5., he subjoins: “These and the like sayings, being spoken of regenerate men, testify that they may fall, and that in case they fall against their consciences they please not God unless they be converted.” Elsewhere he says: “Whereby it hath been said that sins remain in the regenerate, it is necessary that a difference be made; for certain it is that they who rush into sinful practices against conscience do not continue in peace, nor retain faith, righteousness, or the Holy Ghost; neither can faith stand with an evil purpose of heart against conscience.” And a little after he says: “But that they fall from, and shed (*effundunt*) faith and the Holy Ghost, and become guilty of the wrath of God, and of eternal punishment, who commit sin against conscience, many sayings clearly testify, as Gal. v. 19; 1 Cor. vi. 9, etc.” And again in

1 Cor. x. 12: "But that in some who had the beginnings of faith, and afterward falling, return not, that faith of theirs was true before it was lost (*excutitur*), the saying of Peter (2 Pet. ii. 20) testifieth."

That learned Lutheran, Chemnitius, and in fact, the Lutheran divines generally, use the same language, as may be seen in Goodwin's "Redemption Redeemed," Chap. XV. They thus agree precisely with the Arminians, or Remonstrants, of a later time, and the Arminian Methodists, and the bulk of the divines of the Church of England and its offshoots.

Indeed, it is difficult to see how any who believe in the inamissibility of grace can subscribe the articles and homilies of the Church of England and repeat its offices, especially the litany, in which are the most fervent deprecations against all deadly sin and everlasting damnation—of which there can be no danger if grace be inamissible—and the burial service, in which is this solemn petition: "O holy and merciful Saviour, thou most worthy judge eternal, suffer us not at our last hour for any pains of death to fall from thee."

It is said, indeed, that the admonitions and prayers in the homilies and liturgy against apostasy are the means used by God to effectually prevent it. To prevent what? An utter impossibility? Discoursing on the admonition against apostasy, in Heb. vi., John Goodwin says:

> It stands off forty feet at least from all possibility, that the apostle, writing only unto those whom he judged true and sound believers (as appears from several places in the Epistle, as iii. 14; vi. 9) should in the most serious, emphatical, and weighty passages hereof, admonish them of such evils or dangers as only concerned other men, and whereunto themselves were not at all obnoxious; yea, and whereunto if they had been obnoxious, all the cautions, admonitions, warnings, threatenings in the world would not, according to their principles with whom we have now to do, have relieved or delivered them. To say that such admonitions are a means to preserve them from apostasy, who are by other means (as suppose the absolute decree of God, or the interposal of his irresistible power for their perseverance, or the like) in no possibility of apostatizing, is to say that washing is a means to make snow white, or the rearing up of a pillar in the air a means to keep the heavens from falling.

On Heb. x. 38—after censuring the translators for putting "any man" instead of "he" in the passage, "The just shall live by faith, but if any man draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him"—

he says:

> For if it should be supposed that the just man, who is in a way and under a
>
> 177
>
> promise of living by his faith, were in no danger or possibility of drawing back, and that to the loss of the favor of God and ruin of his soul, God must be conceived to speak here at no better rate of wisdom or understanding than this: The just shall live by his faith, but if he shall do that which is simply and utterly impossible for him to do, my soul shall have no pleasure in him. What savor of wisdom, yea, or of common sense, is there in admonishing or cautioning well against such evils, which there is no possibility for them to fall into; yea, and this known unto themselves? Therefore this testimony, for confirmation of the doctrine we maintain, is like "a king upon his throne, against whom there is no rising up."

§ 2. The Thesis to be Defended.

Keeping this in view, we shall proceed to show that saints may and do fall from grace: some partly but not totally or finally; some totally, but not finally; and others both totally and finally. And this will be shown by every kind of proof by which divine truth is set forth in the Holy Scriptures, as will appear by the following digest, or grammar, of some of the salient passages bearing on this subject.

§ 3. Amissibility Set Forth in Scripture Didactically.

The amissibility of grace is set forth by plain, positive didactic statement. Thus David tells Solomon: "If thou seek him, he will be found of thee; but if thou forsake him, he will cast thee off forever." (1 Chron. xxviii. 9.) Thus Azariah told Asa: "The Lord is with you, while ye be with him; and if ye seek him, he will be found of you; but if ye forsake him, he will forsake you." (2 Chron. xv. 2.) This principle of the divine government is articulately and emphatically laid down by God in the prophecy of Ezekiel: "When the righteous turneth away from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity, and doeth according to all the abominations that the wicked man doeth, shall he live? All his righteousness that he hath done shall not be mentioned; in his trespass that he hath trespassed, and in his sin that he hath sinned, in them shall he die. Yet ye say, the way of the

Lord is not equal. Hear now, O house of Israel, Is not my way equal? are not your ways unequal? When a righteous man turneth away from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity, and dieth in them; for his iniquity that he hath done shall he die. Again, when the wicked man turneth away from his wickedness that he hath committed, and doeth that which is lawful and right, he shall save his soul alive." (Ezek. xviii. 24–27.) This equitable principle of the divine government

is repeatedly stated in this book. (*Cf.* chapters iii., xviii., xxxiii.) We hazard nothing in saying that but for the powerful bias of a theological system, which has for one of its essential elements the inamissibility of grace, not a man upon earth would have ever dreamed of putting any other interpretation on these texts than that which lies on their very surface. They are also totally insusceptible of any other meaning. They relate facts as well known, that wicked men sometimes turn from their wickedness, and righteous men sometimes turn from their righteousness. The one case is no more hypothetical than the other; neither would have been stated with so much solemnity, and so often repeated, if the parties respectively could not possibly change their positions and characters. To say that those called righteous were not really righteous, and that their righteousness was self-righteousness, or some other factitious thing that was not good, is as absurd as it would be to say that those called wicked were not really wicked, and that their wickedness was not real, but factitious wickedness. If the wickedness of the latter was not real they ought not to turn from it; and if the righteousness of the former was not real righteousness they ought to turn from it: they will die if they do not. But the reward in the one case is life, and the penalty in the other case is death, whether temporal or eternal belongs not to this argument: only Universalists hold that those who die in their sins, as is said of these apostates, are nevertheless saved in the life eternal. But our Lord told the Jews that if they rejected him they should die in their sins, and he adds: "Whither I go ye cannot come." (John viii. 21–24.)

The principle in question is laid down explicitly by the apostle, (2 Pet. ii. 20–22): "For if after they have escaped the pollutions of the world through the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, they are again entangled therein, and overcome, the latter end is worse with them than the beginning. For it had been better

for them not to have known the way of righteousness, than, after they have known it, to turn from the holy commandment delivered unto them. But it is happened unto them according to the true proverb. The dog is turned to his own vomit again; and, The sow that has washed to her wallowing in the mire."

It speaks but little for the exegetical skill of those who say the knowledge of those apostates was "merely speculative, not

experimental." If this be merely speculative knowledge, we wish there were more of it among men, as through it they would escape the pollutions of the world. Nay, this knowledge is eminently experimental and practical; it is the very same as that of which our Lords speaks in John xvii. 3, and the apostles in Eph. iv.; 1 John ii. 4; iii. 6.; Phil. iii. And it speaks as little for the candor or common sense of those who say that these apostates were dogs and swine, and that notwithstanding their vomiting and washing their nature was never changed. This is to make, as Goodwin says, "parables or similitudes run on all fours." The only points of resemblance here are the vomiting and the cleaning, as Calvin clearly saw. "Suppose," says Goodwin, "a dog should, by casting up his vomit, be turned into a sheep, and afterward should, by a contrary means—viz., by resuming it—become a dog again; might it not truly and properly enough be said that this dog, though lately a sheep, is now become a dog again?" But it is humiliating to notice such pitiful subterfuges.

This passage agrees precisely with our Lord's declaration: "Ye are the salt of the earth; but if the salt have lost his savor, wherewith shall it be salted? it is thenceforth good for nothing, but to be cast out, and to be trodden under foot of men." (Matt. v. 13.) At first view this passage seems to favor Novatianism; but it does not. It affirms that Christians may fall from grace, but it does not say that they cannot be reclaimed. The peculiar virtue of salt when once lost (as it may be) cannot be restored by any known process; it is worthless. If Christians whose business it is to purify the world fail to do so, and are corrupted by it, there is nothing in the world which can restore to them their purifying virtue; they become worthless as the world itself. He who first made the mineral can, indeed, impart to it afresh its saline property; so apostates can be restored by his grace, if they will avail themselves of it. But as the loss is total, so it may be, and frequently is, final.

Ah, Lord, with trembling I confess
A gracious soul may fall from grace;
The salt may lose its seasoning power
And never, never find it more.

§ 4. Amissibility Implied in Positive Divine Injunctions.

The amissibility of grace is implied in positive divine injunctions.

180

By injunctions we mean commands, enjoining final perseverance, and interdicts of apostasy, with proper legislative sanctions. This is fully set forth in Heb. iii., where the apostle is addressing "holy brethren, partakers of the heavenly calling" in Christ Jesus, "whose house are we, if we hold fast the confidence and the rejoicing of the hope firm unto the end." The injunctions given to these "holy brethren, partakers of the heavenly calling, the house of Christ," are of this tenor: "Wherefore as the Holy Ghost saith, To-day if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts, as in the provocation, in the day of temptation in the wilderness. Take heed, brethren, lest there be in any of you an evil heart of unbelief, in departing from the living God, But exhort one another daily, while it is called today; lest any of you be hardened through the deceitfulness of sin. For we are made partakers of Christ, if we hold the beginning of our confidence steadfast unto the end; while it is said. To-day if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts, as in the provocation. And to whom sware he that they should not enter into his rest, but to them that believed not? So we see that they could not enter in because of unbelief. Let us therefore fear, lest, a promise being left us of entering into his rest, any of you should seem to come short of it. Let us labor therefore to enter into that rest, lest any man fall after the same example of unbelief. Seeing then that we have a great High-priest, that is passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast our profession." (Heb. iii.; iv.)

Here is the key-note of the Epistle to the Hebrews. All the exhortations, warnings, expostulations, and promises contained in the epistle are based upon this divine legislation. God commands us to persevere in faith and holiness; he forbids any dereliction under pain of exclusion from the heavenly rest. The plain English of it is

simply this: Continue to the end of your lives in faith and obedience, and you will be saved; otherwise you will be lost forever. It is pitiful to see the torturing methods adopted to evade the force of this plain injunction. Apostates, say some, only *seem* to come short of entering heaven—though they really do enter, as none can finally fall from grace. But the apostle tells us what this seeming to come short means; it is obviously failing to enter heaven, just as those whose carcasses fell in the wilderness failed to enter Canaan. MacKnight, though a professed

Calvinist, renders "should actually fall short of it." He refers to his note on 1 Cor. vii., where he says:

"And I am certain that even I have the Spirit of God." The word δοκέω in this, as in many other passages, does not express *doubting*, but *certainty*. Thus 1 Cor. iv. 9: "I am certain God hath." 1 Cor. viii. 2: "If therefore any one is confident of knowing." Heb. iv. 1: "Any of you should actually fall short." Mark x. 32: "They who exercise rule." Luke viii. 18: "What he really hath." 1 Cor. xi. 16: "If any one resolves to be contentious." 1 Cor. xiv. 32: "If any one really is a prophet." To show that the Greeks themselves used the word to denote *certainty* and *reality*, Dr. Pearce quotes Ulpian, in Demosth. Olynth. i., who says: "Δοκεῖν is used by the ancients, not always to express what is doubtful, but likewise to express what is certain." From these examples it is evident that the word δοκέω in this verse does not imply that the apostle was in any doubt whether he was inspired in giving this judgment: it is only a soft way of expressing his certain knowledge of his own inspiration, and may have been used in irony of the false teacher, who called his inspiration in question.

Dr. Moses Stuart, of the same school, in his note on Heb. iv. 1, says:

Lest any of you may fail of obtaining it. By sacred and classical usage δοκέω is frequently joined with other verbs, without making any *essential* addition to the sense of them. It is said, therefore, to be used *pleonastically*; by which, however, can be meant only that it is incapable of being precisely rendered into our own language, and *apparently* adds nothing essential to the sense of a phrase. But even this is not exactly true of δοκέω. In many cases it is plainly designed to soften the expression to which it is attached—*e. g.*, 1 Cor. vii. 40, Paul says: "I seem to myself to possess the Spirit of God"—a modest way of asserting the fact, instead of speaking categorically. In a similar way δοκέω in 1 Cor. xiv. 37; x. 12: "he who seems to himself to stand;" iii. 18; iv. 9. In a few cases it is difficult to distinguish what addition is made to the phrase by the use of δοκέω—*e. g.*, Luke xxii. 24—δοκεῖ εἶναι = εἴη. So Luke viii. 18; ὁ δοκεῖ ἔχειν is

expressed in Luke xix. 26 by ὁ ἔχει; 1 Cor. xi. 16. There can scarcely be a doubt, however, that in all cases the Greeks designed to give some coloring to a sentence by employing it. It would often seem to be something near to our *may, might, can, could,* etc., when used to soften forms of expression that might have been categorical. So Theophylact understood it in our phrase; he thus explains: "lest he may come short, and fail to enter into the promised rest." The writer uses *a mild and gentle address*, not saying μὴ ὑστερήσῃ, but μὴ δοκῇ ὑστερηκέναι. This, I apprehend, is hitting the exact force of the phrase here, an imperfect view of which is given in the lexicons.

If in these cases δοκέω be not absolutely expletive, it must be confessed, as Stewart says, it is difficult to render it in English. If it does not strengthen the term, it surely does not weaken it.

Bloomfield renders: "Let us then be afraid lest, though there be a promise left us of entering into his rest, any of you should be found (lit. 'be deemed') to have fallen short of it." He says:

I find this view of the sense confirmed by the Peschito Syriac, Vulgate, and Arabic

versions and the best modern expositors; and it also seems required by the context, and the *usus linguae* as to καταλείπω which, as it is used by Polybius, often of a *hope*, by others of an inheritance, so may it of a promise; especially, since the promise here has reference to the heavenly inheritance. Besides the sense, "a promise being still *left*," is far more agreeable to the context, implying that the promised rest had not yet been enjoyed, but was *left* for others to enter upon. The above reading of δοκῇ is confirmed by the Peschito Syriac version, and by an able paraphrase. However, the full sense is, "should be *deemed by the event*"—a mild expression, intended to soften the harshness of the term ὑστερηκέναι, implying utter failure, usually by neglect.

If δοκῇ be not merely expletive, or used *urbanely*, it means *to appear, to be obvious,* which is what Bloomfield means by "deemed by the event." Apostates not only fail, but obviously fail to enter into the heavenly rest.

An apology is perhaps due for dwelling so long upon so clear a case; but it is found in the fact that it absolutely settles this question. God commands us to persevere, and threatens us that if we do not persevere, upon his oath, we shall not enter into his rest. Well may we have the *fear* which begets caution and diligent effort, as this serious warning is no empty threat. "Vengeance is mine: I will repay, saith the Lord; and again. The Lord will judge his

people”—“will condemn and punish his apostatizing people,” as Bloomfield and others interpret Heb. x. 30.

This gives force to the injunction of the apostle, addressed to “all the saints in Christ Jesus, at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons:” “Wherefore, my beloved, as ye have always obeyed, not as in my presence only, but now much more in my absence, work out your own salvation with fear and trembling: for it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure—holding forth the word of life; that I may rejoice in the day of Christ, that I have not run in vain, neither labored in vain.” (Phil. ii. 12–16.) He gives this injunction to “saints,” who could work out their own salvation, because God worked in them, and who for that very reason were bound to do so—and that with fear and trembling, lest they might prove delinquent, and so the apostle’s labor, so far as they were concerned, should be lost; whereas if they complied with the injunction he should have the great privilege of rejoicing over their salvation in the day of Christ, that is, the day of final retribution. Can any thing be more explicit than this?

183

Then look at the “commandment” to fidelity, so often repeated in “the final document of the New Testament”—the First Epistle of John—*e. g.*: “My little children, these things write I unto you that ye sin not.” “I have not written unto you because ye know not the truth, but because ye know it.” “Let that therefore abide in you, which ye have heard from the beginning. If that which ye have heard from the beginning shall remain in you, ye also shall continue in the Son, and in the Father. And this is the promise that he hath promised us, even eternal life. These things have I written unto you concerning them that seduce you. And now little children, abide in him; that, when he shall appear, we may have confidence, and not be ashamed before him at his coming.” (1 John ii.)

The beloved disciple must indeed have been in his dotage—inspiration being out of the question—if he took so much pains to command his spiritual children to do what they could not help doing, and not to do what they could not help avoiding, and that under the peril of losing what was inamissively secured to them. But we should have to transcribe a large portion of the Scriptures if we were to adduce all the passages which enjoin perseverance in piety as the condition of ultimate salvation.

§ 5. Amissibility Implied in Exhortations to Perseverance.

The amissibility of grace is implied in the exhortations to perseverance, with which the Scriptures abound. These exhortations are so numerous that one knows not where to begin or end in citing them. They are coupled, too, with dehortations from apostasy, of the most pointed character. Thus our Lord says repeatedly to his disciples: “Take ye heed, watch and pray.” “Watch ye therefore; for ye know not when the master of the house cometh, lest coming suddenly he find you sleeping. And what I say unto you I say unto all, Watch.” “Watch ye and pray, that ye enter not into temptation.” (Mark xiii.; xiv.) “Exhorting them to continue in the faith.” (Acts xiv. 22.) “Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood. For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away

disciples after them. Therefore watch, and remember, that by the space of three years I ceased not to warn every one night and day with tears.” (Acts xx. 28–31.) Yet there was no possibility of their seduction to error and sin and final ruin! Paul might have spared his exhortations, and also his toils and tears!

“Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good.” (Rom. xii. 21.) “It is high time to wake out of sleep: for now is our salvation nearer than when we believed.” “Let us therefore cast off the works of darkness, and let us put on the armor of light.” “But put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make not provision for the flesh to fulfill, the lusts thereof.” (Rom. xiii. 11–14.) What impertinent, supererogatory counsels are these, if *believers*, as those were whom Paul addressed, cannot fall into the scandalous sins against which they are here admonished. Truly those who do not cast off these works of darkness will be cast into outer darkness, which will be felt to be the more horrible because they once walked in the light.

“Know ye not that they which run in a race run all, but one receiveth the prize? So run, that ye may obtain. And every man that striveth for the mastery is temperate in all things. Now they do it to

obtain a corruptible crown; but we an incorruptible. I therefore so run, not as uncertainly; so fight I, not as one that beateth the air: but I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection; lest that by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself should be a castaway." (1 Cor. ix. 24–27.) Why should Paul urge the Corinthian believers to run that race and gain the crown if they could not help running, or whether they ran or not could not fail to get the crown? And why should he set himself before them as an example—exercising himself with the greatest diligence and godly fear, lest after being a herald to other athletes, he himself should be hurled from the stadium as vanquished in the contest, if there were no possibility of failure? "Therefore, my beloved brethren, be ye steadfast, unmovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labor is not in vain in the Lord." (1 Cor. xv. 58.) Why exhort his "beloved brethren" thus to perseverance in their "labor," if there was no danger of their ceasing to labor and losing their reward?

"We then, as workers together with him, beseech you also that ye receive not the grace of God in vain." (2 Cor. vi. 1.) Why this

exhortation, if grace be inamissible? How can it be received in vain, if it infallibly secures our salvation? "And let us not be weary in well-doing: for in due season we shall reap, if we faint not." (Gal. vi. 9.) Why this exhortation, if we cannot faint? or whether we faint or not, we shall be sure to reap?

After exhorting the Ephesians to abstain from the gross vices of the heathen around them, the apostle says: "Let no man deceive you with vain words; for because of these things cometh the wrath of God upon the children of disobedience. Be not ye therefore partakers with them. For ye were sometimes darkness, but now are ye light in the Lord: walk as children of light." "See then that ye walk circumspectly: not as fools, but as wise." "Finally, my brethren, be strong in the Lord, and in the power of his might. Put on the whole armor of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil." (Eph. v.; vi.) Why all these exhortations, if they could not be overcome by the world, the flesh, and the devil? if there was no possibility of their being partakers with the wicked in their sins and punishment?

"Ye know how we exhorted and comforted and charged every one of you, as a father doth his children, that ye would walk worthy

of God, who hath called you unto his kingdom and glory." (1 Thess. ii. 11, 12.) Why all this exhorting, comforting, and charging, if they could not help so walking, and if they could not fail of "his kingdom and glory?" Then see how the apostle exhorts the Thessalonian brethren in the close of this Epistle—precisely as if he knew they were both to fall into the sins which are there specified, and to neglect the duties which are there prescribed: would there be any sense or consistency in his doing so, if such had not been the case?

After calling attention to the worthies who had successfully run their race, the apostle thus exhorts the Hebrew Christians: "Wherefore, seeing we also are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, let us lay aside every weight, and the sin which doth so easily beset us, and let us run with patience [perseverance] the race that is set before us, looking unto Jesus the author and finisher of our faith—lest ye be wearied and faint in your minds. Ye have not yet resisted unto blood, striving against sin. And ye have forgotten the exhortation which speaketh unto you as unto children. My son despise not thou the chastening of the Lord, nor faint when thou art rebuked of him: Wherefore

lift up the hands which hang down, and the feeble knees; and make straight paths for your feet, lest that which is lame be turned out of the way; but let it rather be healed. Follow peace with all men, and holiness, without which no man can see the Lord: looking diligently lest any man fail of the grace of God: Wherefore we receiving a kingdom which cannot be moved, let us have grace, whereby we may serve God acceptably with reverence and godly fear: for our God is a consuming fire." (Heb. xii.) What sense or pertinency is there in these exhortations, if their perseverance in the Christian race was certain, absolute, inevitable—if they could not fail of the grace of God, fall behind in the race, and so lose the prize? (*Cf.* Rom. iii. 23; Heb. iv. 1.)

"Wherefore, beloved, seeing ye look for such things, be diligent that ye may be found of him in peace, without spot and blameless. Ye therefore, beloved, seeing ye know these things before, beware lest ye also, being led away with the error of the wicked, fall from your own steadfastness. But grow in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." (2 Pet. iii. 14–18.) Why should the condition of future retribution move them to diligence? Why

should they beware of seduction and apostasy? Why should they be so concerned to grow in grace, if they could not lose it, and fail of their reward? Peter evidently agreed with his "beloved brother Paul," and the beloved disciple John, who exhorts his converts: "Look to yourselves, that we lose not those things which we have wrought, but that we receive a full reward." (2 John 8.) Why should they beware of losing what cannot be lost? No matter which reading is adopted—*we* or *ye*—it is clear that the apostle considered that the reward might be lost. By saying a full reward, Bloomfield suggests that "πλήρη hints at *some* reward that the teacher would receive in the other case; which, indeed, were but just, since disciples may apostatize and bring discredit on the master, without his being to blame."

§ 6. Amissibility Implied in the Expostulations Concerning Apostasy.

The amissibility of grace is implied in the expostulations in regard to apostasy, with which the Scriptures abound. How pathetic are these expostulations in Ezek. iii.; xviii.; xxxiii. "Why will ye die, O house of Israel? The righteouness of the righteous

shall not deliver him in the day of his transgression. When I shall say to the righteous that ye shall surely live: if he trust to his own righteousness, and commit iniquity, all his righteousness shall not be remembered; but for his iniquity that he hath committed, he shall die for it." How often is this repeated by God in this prophecy, ending thus: "Yet ye say, The way of the Lord is not equal. O ye house of Israel, I will judge you every one after his ways." We have already noticed the principle of the divine government here recognized; the point now to be regarded is the great stress which is here laid upon it. It would seem that the Holy Spirit foresaw the error in question, and took this method to refute it. How strange that it should be revived and perpetuated in these last days!

How did our Lord expostulate with his disciples in regard to apostasy, of which many were guilty: "Will ye also go away?" (John vi. 66, 67.) He knew that there was one of the twelve that would apostatize, and this gave force to his expostulation.

The apostle, writing to the Corinthians, says: "Through thy knowledge shall the weak brother perish, for whom Christ died?

But when ye sin so against the brethren, and wound their weak conscience, ye sin against Christ. Wherefore, if meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no meat while the world standeth." (1 Cor. viii. 11–13.) Only one sense can be attached to these words. The apostle expostulates with the Corinthians on behalf of the weak brethren, that they should be exceedingly careful not to cause them to stumble, and thus those for whom Christ died should be caused to *perish*. (*Cf.* Rom. xiv. 27.)

Hear how the apostle expostulates with the Galatians: "I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ unto another gospel, which is not another." "O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you, that ye should not obey the truth, before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth, crucified among you? this only would I learn of you, Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?" "Are ye so foolish? having begun in the Spirit, are ye now made perfect by the flesh?" "Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage. Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised Christ shall profit you nothing."

"Christ is become of no effect unto yon, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace." "Ye did run well, who did hinder you, that ye should not obey the truth?" "Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap. For he that soweth to the flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting. And let us not be weary in well-doing: for in due season we shall reap if we faint not." But the whole Epistle is a continued expostulation with them in regard to apostasy, into which many of them had fallen and of which the rest were in imminent danger. They did run well, but were hindered; they had sown to the Spirit, but were now sowing to the flesh, and the apostle expostulates with them on their sad defection, urging them to start afresh in the divine life, as it was necessary for them to be born again, so completely had they—at least many of them—gone back to their unregenerate state. How touchingly he addresses them: "Where is then the blessedness ye spoke of? for I bear you record, that, if it had been possible, ye would have plucked out your own eyes, and have given them to me. My little children, of

whom I travail in birth again until Christ be formed in you, I desire to be present with you now, and to change my voice, for I stand in doubt of you." Why doubt if they could not fall from grace (which he says was the case with them), or, having fallen, could not possibly fail to rise again, no matter how deep they sunk into sin, or how long they wallowed in it! The expostulations of this Epistle call to mind those of the Prophet Hosea. How tenderly, pathetically, powerfully does God address himself to his backsliding people: "Ephraim is joined to idols; let him alone." This is addressed to Judah, to keep him from going into the worship of false gods, as Ephraim had done. "O Ephraim, what shall I do unto thee? O Judah, what shall I do unto thee? for your goodness is as a morning cloud, and as the early dew it goeth away. How shall I give thee up Ephraim? O Israel, return unto the Lord thy God, for thou hast fallen by thine iniquity." And so from the beginning to the end.

All these expostulations—for what? If they could not fall, then they were not fallen. If fallen and yet could not be lost, then they must rise, and would rise without all this ado.

§ 7. Amissibility Implied in the Warnings Against Apostasy.

189

The amissibility of grace is implied in the warnings against apostasy, with which the Scriptures abound. Many of these warnings have been already noticed under the preceding heads. How pregnantly does Christ repeat the warning concerning the salt losing its savor: "Salt is good: but if the salt have lost his savor, wherewith shall it be seasoned? It is neither fit for the land, nor for the dunghill; but men cast it out. He that hath ears to hear, let him hear." (Luke xiv. 34, 35; *cf.* Matt. v. 13; Mark ix. 50.)

See how the apostle warns the Gentiles, who, like wild olive-branches, had been grafted into the good olive tree, in place of the Jews, the natural branches: "Because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith. Be not highminded, but fear: for if God spared not the natural branches, take heed lest he also spare not thee. Behold therefore the goodness and severity of God: on them which fell, severity; but toward thee, goodness, if thou continue in his goodness; otherwise thou also shalt be cut off." (Rom. xi. 20–23.) Does that mean nothing? Is that a warning

against an impossibility?

Read 1 Cor. x. 1–12. Here the apostle speaks of the "fathers" as baptized into the covenant of Moses, and sharing in all its blessings. "But with many of them God was not well pleased; for they were overthrown in the wilderness. Now these things were our examples, to the intent we should not lust after evil things, as they also lusted. Neither be ye idolaters; neither let us commit fornication; neither let us tempt Christ; neither murmur ye, as some of them also murmured, and were destroyed of the destroyer. Now all these things happened unto them for ensamples; and they are written for our admonition upon whom the ends of the world are come. Wherefore, let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall." Why this admonition? why adduce all these "examples" (τύποι), types, if there was no danger of our imitating them? Why admonish us to stand, and to take heed lest we fall, if we cannot help standing, if we cannot fall? And why warn us against falling after the example of those who fall to rise no more, if there were no danger, no possibility of our so doing?

In his Epistle to the Hebrews, as we have seen, the apostle

reverts to the same melancholy examples of final apostasy, and warns the Christians against their imitation. These warnings are repeated in that Epistle with the utmost earnestness and vehemence. "Cast not away therefore your confidence," says he, "which hath great recompense of reward. For ye have need of patience, that after ye have done the will of God, ye might receive the promise." "Now the just shall live by faith; but if any man draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him. But we are not of them who draw back unto perdition; but of them that believe to the saving of the soul." (Heb. x. 35–39.) The thirty-eighth verse ought to have been simply rendered: "But if he shall draw back," namely, the just man who lives by faith. We are disinclined to charge the translators with Calvinistic leanings in their translation, though it is difficult to free them from that charge in this place and in Heb. vi. 6: "If they shall fall away" for "And fall away." The passage shows clearly that the just man who then lived by his faith might cast away his shield and draw back from the field; and the apostle speaks of some who did thus draw back even to perdition, though he hoped that those whom he addressed would not prove to be of that number, but of those who continue to believe to the saving of

the soul. His reason for that hope is given in the sixth chapter: no fancied decrees of predestination, no dream about the inamissibility of grace; but their continued obedience, which he desired that they should show "with diligence to the full assurance of hope unto the end: that ye be not slothful, but followers of them who through faith and patience inherit the promises." Can language be more explicit? Can warnings be more earnest or indicate more danger?

Then listen to the warnings given by Christ from the throne of his glory to the Seven Apocalyptic Churches. He says all the good he can of them, but hear him to the Church of Ephesus: "Nevertheless, I have somewhat against thee, because thou has left thy first love. Remember therefore from whence thou art fallen, and repent, and do the first works; or else I will come unto thee quickly, and will remove thy candlestick out of his place, except thou repent." So he had a few things against the Church in Pergamos, and warns them accordingly: "Repent, or else I will come unto thee quickly, and I will fight against them with the sword of my mouth." So to the Church at Sardis

and at Laodicea, whom he threatened with vengeance if they did not repent, and to spew them out of his mouth, if they continued in their lukewarm or backslidden state. What was the design of these warnings? To excite them to fear where no fear was? to operate irresistibly to secure the end desired? We defy any man to show where this was ever God's design in warning men from apostasy and ruin; and whether or not it was so in this case let the result show. That these things, too, were written for our admonition there can be no doubt, for every Epistle closes with this solemn *finale*: "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the Churches." (Rev. ii.; iii.).

See how earnestly Paul warns the Corinthians: "Would to God ye would bear with me a little in my folly; and indeed bear with me. For I am jealous over you with a godly jealousy." "But I fear lest by any means as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ." (2 Cor. xi. 1–3.) We know how Eve was deceived; we know how through her Adam fell, and so, says the apostle, I warn you not to be so ensnared by Satan's devices. (*Cf.* 2 Cor. xii. 19–21.)

So Peter warns us against the enemy when he comes in another manner; "Be sober, be vigilant; because your adversary the devil, as

a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour; whom resist steadfast in the faith." (1 Peter v. 8, 9.)

But enough, though there is no end to such warnings—while every one of them, even the least, would be an impertinence if the grace of God were inamissible.

§ 8. Amissibility Implied in the Rewards Promised to Perseverance.

The inamissibility of grace is implied in the promises of reward if we persevere to the end. This is the tenor of them all: "He that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved." (Matt. xxiv. 13.) "Then said Jesus to those Jews which believed on him, If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed; and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." (John viii. 31, 32.) "Brethren, if any of you do err from the truth, and one convert him; let him know, that he which converteth the sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from

death, and shall hide a multitude of sins." (James v. 19, 20.) "Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life." (Rev. ii. 10.) "Whereby are given unto us exceeding great and precious promises, that by these ye might be partakers of the divine nature, having escaped the corruption that is in the world through lust. And besides this, giving all diligence, add to your faith virtue; and to virtue, knowledge; and to knowledge, temperance; and to temperance, patience; and to patience, godliness; and to godliness, brotherly kindness; and to brotherly kindness, charity. For if these things be in you, and abound, they make you that ye shall neither be barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ. But he that lacketh these things is blind, and cannot see afar off, and hath forgotten that he has been purged from his old sins. Wherefore the rather, brethren, give diligence to make your calling and election sure; for if ye do these things ye shall never fall: for so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." (2 Pet. i. 4–11.) If there were not another syllable on the subject in holy writ, this pregnant passage would settle the question. There is no torturing it into any thing else. It makes no sense at all, if grace be inamissible. Here are some, with whom the faithful are contrasted,

who had forgotten that they were purged from their old sins, that is, they had so far relapsed into their state before conversion that their Christian state was passed over as a parenthesis scarcely to be noticed. But the "brethren"—the only place in the Epistle where they are so addressed—are encouraged to hold on to their religion and be faithful to the end, by the promise of a glorious triumph—which is the meaning of the entrance ministered abundantly into the everlasting kingdom: like conquerors they should drive in state through the gates, enlarged for the occasion, into the city. (*Cf.* Rev. xxii. 14.) If they *add* (that is, *supply*, ἐπιχορηγηθήσεται) what is necessary to constitute a fully developed Christian character; God will *minister* (that is, *supply*, the same word, ἐπιχορηγηθήσεται) which is necessary for their triumph. These promises were given to stimulate them to final perseverance, to make their calling and election sure. What sense would there be to encourage them to do so by these promises, if they could not possibly fail? There are no *ifs* and *buts* about it, no room for promissory incentives to perseverance

any more than for warnings from defection. If grace be inamissible the whole is a grand impertinence.

§ 9. Amissibility Implied in the Prayers for Perseverance.

The amissibility of grace is implied in the prayers for perseverance, with which the Scriptures abound. These prayers are deprecatory, looking to apostasy as not only possible, but certain, unless great assistance be afforded to prevent it; supplicatory, earnestly imploring persevering grace; and intercessory, offered for the perseverance of others. We can only give a few specimens. David prays, when penitent for his apostasy: "Create in me a clean heart, O God; and renew a right spirit within me. Cast me not away from thy presence; and take not thy Holy Spirit from me. Restore unto me the joy of thy salvation; and uphold me with thy free Spirit." (Ps. li. 10–12.) "Uphold me, according unto thy word, that I may live; and let me not be ashamed of my hope. Hold thou me up, and I shall be safe: and I will have respect unto thy statutes continually." (Ps. cxix. 116, 117.) "Wherefore also we pray always for you, that our God would count you worthy of this calling, and

fulfill all the good pleasure of his goodness, and the work of faith with power: that the name of our Lord Jesus Christ may be glorified in you, and ye in him, according to the grace of our God and the Lord Jesus Christ." (2 Thess. i. 11, 12.) "And the Lord said, Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat: but I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not: and when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren." (Luke xxii. 31, 32.) "Holy Father, keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me, that they may be one, as we are. I pray not that thou shouldst take them out of the world, but that thou shouldst keep them from the evil." (John xvii. 11–15.)

We need hardly say that neither our own prayers for ourselves, nor the intercessory prayers of others for us, including those of our great Advocate and High-priest, will keep us from falling, and secure our final perseverance, without our voluntary concurrence with the gracious influence brought to bear upon us in answer to prayer. If this principle be not admitted, then no sinner could ever continue a moment in sin, and no saint could ever fall. In default of this, many prayers return to the bosom of those who offer them; they are not offered in vain, though they

fail to effect the result intended. But it would be preposterous to pray for a thing in itself impossible, or for a thing absolutely inevitable.

§ 10. Amissibility Demonstrated by Scriptural Examples of Apostasy.

The amissibility of grace is demonstrated by the examples of apostasy recorded in the Scriptures, to say nothing of those that come under our personal observation. Saul, the king of Israel, was undoubtedly a good man, and was specially favored by heaven. Thus Samuel said to, him: "The Spirit of the Lord will come upon thee, and thou shalt prophesy with them and shalt be turned into another man. And let it be, when these signs are come unto thee, that thou do as occasion serve thee; for God is with thee." (1 Sam. x. 6, 7.)

But Saul fell from grace. "And when Saul inquired of the Lord, the Lord answered him not." And Samuel told him: "The Lord is departed from thee, and is become thine enemy," as he was before

with him and was his friend. The result is known. He was overcome by his enemies. “Therefore Saul took a sword and fell upon it. So Saul died.” (1 Sam. xxviii.; xxxi.) Comment is unnecessary. His fall was final.

David was an eminent saint. Yet David fell into adultery, lying, hypocrisy, and murder, of the foulest kind. His apostasy was total. He seemed to be in a state of utter hardness and impenitency for a twelvemonth, when he was aroused to a sense of his dreadful condition, and the fifty-first Psalm is a record of his bitter repentance: “Make me to hear joy and gladness; that the bones which thou hast broken may rejoice. Hide thy face from my sins, and blot out all my iniquities. Create in me a clean heart, O God; and renew a right spirit within me.” If he had died during that appalling period of his history he would have been damned like any other adulterer and murderer, and would have had his portion with hypocrites and liars: we know what that is.

Then there was his son Solomon, named also Jedidiah, that is, “Beloved of the Lord.” (1 Sam. xii. 24, 25.) “And Solomon loved the Lord, walking in the statutes of David, his father.” (1 Kings iii.) It is needless to descant upon his excellent piety, his superlative wisdom, his divine inspiration. He was high

in the favor of God. But see how he fell. Look at him with his thousand idolatrous wives and concubines, building altars for their outlandish gods, and bowing down and worshiping them; oppressing his subjects, and bringing down upon his hoary head the curses of God and man. His fall was total; whether it was final no man can tell. We know what he himself said: “He, that being often reproved hardeneth his neck, shall suddenly be destroyed, and that without remedy.” “The backslider in heart shall be filled with his own ways.” (Prov. xxix. 1.)

Judas was once a good man: as far as appears from the history, on a par with the other apostles. He was called by Christ to the apostolate; he was endowed with miraculous powers; he was admitted into the society of Christ and his chosen disciples, and shared his most intimate friendship. Yet Judas proved a traitor. Satan entered into him, and for thirty pieces of silver he betrayed his Lord. The Saviour speaks of him as lost: “Those that thou gavest me I have kept, and none of them is lost, but the son of perdition.” (John xvii. 12.) What a loss! What a fall! Thus Peter and the other

apostles and disciples speak of him as falling from this ministry and apostleship by transgression, that he might go—or so that he went —to his own place. (Acts i. 25.) How sad is the record of his apostasy, which was both total and final: “Then Judas which had betrayed him, when he saw that he was condemned, repented himself, and brought again the thirty pieces of silver to the chief priests and elders, saying, I have sinned in that I have betrayed the innocent blood. And they said. What is that to us? see thou to that. And he cast down the pieces of silver in the temple, and departed, and went and hanged himself.” (Matt. xxvii. 3–5.)

Then there was Peter. Surely he was an apostate; for he denied his Lord with bitter imprecations. Whether, as casuists dispute, his sin was one of infirmity or of presumption, all admit it was not a sin of ignorance. Peter sinned against the clearest light, the richest love, the highest professions, and the most timely warnings. The turpitude of his sin is seen in the intensity of his repentance: Peter wept bitterly. His triple denial calls for a triple attestation of his love when “restored by reconciling grace.” His fall, if total, was not final, as he soon repented of his foul revolt.

From his bitter experience Peter was prepared to warn Christians against apostasy. He speaks of some who had known the way of righteousness, and turned from it: whose latter end was worse than the beginning, as they had returned to their vomit and to their wallowing in the mire of their unregenerate state; so that it would have been better for them not to have known the way of righteousness. If this is not a total and a final revolt we know not what can be.

Paul says explicitly of the Galatians that they had “fallen from grace.” We have no assurance that they were recovered from their fall; but if they were, it was by the same repentance, faith, and regeneration by which they were first put into a state of grace.

The immoral Corinthian whom the apostle excluded from the Church because of his vile conduct, would have been lost forever if he had not bitterly repented of his sin and been restored by renewing grace.

In 1 Tim. i. 19, 20 Paul speaks of Hymeneus and Alexander, who concerning faith had made shipwreck (and everybody knows what shipwreck means(, and had put away both faith and a good conscience. Surely it will not be disputed that they had fallen from

grace totally. Whether their fall was final we cannot tell. Paul says he "delivered them unto Satan that they might learn not to blaspheme," that is, he cast them out of the Church, that by this censure they might learn the enormity of their offense and be brought to repentance. Whether they repented we cannot tell. In the Second Epistle to Timothy (ii. 17, 18) Paul says that Hymeneus and Philetus erred concerning the truth, saying that the resurrection is past already and overthrowing the faith of some. "Alexander the coppersmith did me much evil: the Lord reward him according to his works: of whom be thou ware also; for he hath greatly withstood our words." (2 Tim. iv. 14, 15.) Surely this was a shipwreck of the faith, total and, we should think, final also.

We need scarcely revert to the Hebrew apostates spoken of in Heb. vi. 4–6. Paul says expressly that men who were saints of no ordinary attainments "fell away"—which is the literal rendering of the aorist, which our translators unfortunately render "if they shall fall away." This rendering is deeply to be regretted, as it is very difficult to conceive how it could be made

without a dogmatic bias. Macknight, who was a professed Calvinist, says:

> The verbs φωτισθέντας, γευσαμένους, and γενηθέντας, being aorists, are rightly rendered by our translators in the past time—*who were enlightened, have tasted, were made partakers.* Wherefore παραπεσόντας, being an aorist, ought likewise to have been translated in the past time, *have fallen away*. Nevertheless our translators, following Beza, who without any authority from ancient MSS. hath inserted in his version the word, *Si*, *If*, have rendered this clause, *If they fell away*, that this text might not appear to contradict the doctrine of the perseverance of the saints. But as no translator should take upon him to add to, or alter the Scriptures, for the sake of any favorite doctrine, I have translated παραπεσόντας in the past tense, *have fallen away*, according to the true import of the word as standing in connection with the other aorists in the preceding verses. Further, as παραπεσόντας is put in opposition to what goes before in the fourth and fifth verses, the conjunction καί, with which it is introduced, must have here its adversative signification—*and yet have fallen away.*

Wall, in his note on this verse, says:

> I know of none but Beza whom the English translators could follow. The Vulgate hath, *et prolapsi sunt*; the Syriac, *qui rursum peccaverunt*; Castalio, *et tamen relabuntur*. The word παραπεσόντας literally signifies *have fallen down*. But it is rightly translated *have fallen away*, because the apostle

is speaking not of any common lapse, but of apostasy from the Christian faith. See Heb. x. 29, where a further display of the evil of apostasy is made.

This is judicious. It might be better, perhaps, to render the aorist as Rotherham renders it, “and who fell away,” which makes it more distinctively refer to actual apostasy. The persons in question were well known as apostates from the faith, and are spoken of accordingly. Their fall was total and it would seem final also, as was that of some of the other apostates named.

§ 11. Amissibility Inculcated in Parables of our Lord,

The amissibility of grace is inculcated in several of our Lord’s parables. In the parable of the sower this doctrine is clearly exhibited. There are four descriptions of ground cultivated. The sower is one; the seed is the same in all cases. The intention of the husbandman is the same: he sows in order to get a crop. In one case the seed takes no root; in another case it brings forth a harvest; but in two intermediate cases it takes root and grows, but fails to come to perfection; and in both these cases the fault is entirely in the soil. Thorns and stones occasion the failure.

Now, we must not make the parable run on all fours. It was

not within its province to set forth the operation of preventing grace, necessary in every case to prepare the soil for the reception and development of the seed. The wayside hearer might have improved that grace so as to have profited by the word. The stony-ground and thorny-ground hearers might have so improved that grace as to bring forth fruit to perfection, as did those who are represented by the good ground—made good by that same grace duly improved. They began well, but fell from grace, and proved as fruitless in the end as those who never used the grace at all.

The parable of the vine and its branches teaches the same lesson: “I am the true vine, and my Father is the husbandman. Every branch in me that beareth not fruit he taketh away.” “If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch, and is withered; and men gather them, and cast them into the fire, and they are burned. If ye abide in me, and my words abide in you, ye shall ask what ye will, and it shall be done unto you. Herein is my Father

glorified, that ye bear much fruit; so shall ye be my disciples. As the Father hath loved me, so have I loved you: continue ye in my love." (John xv. 1–9.) As no torturing can set aside this testimony, so no comment is needed to explain it. All the branches were in the vine: they belonged to it. Some ceased to imbibe the sap from the trunk, ceased to be fruitful, ceased to live; they are cut off from the vine; they are burned in the fire. If this is not total and final apostasy, what is it? and what is total and final apostasy? And if this is not the teaching of the parable, what does it teach? If the disciples to whom the parable was addressed were not liable to become barren and unfruitful, why address the parable to them? If they could not fail to continue in the Saviour's love, why set forth this parable to show the fearful consequences of a failure so to do? Why tell them, "If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love?" They would abide in his love in any case, they could not get out of it, if grace be inamissible. Once in the vine, never out of it; once in grace, always in grace!

But if there were nothing else in the Scriptures touching this subject but the parable of the unmerciful servant, that would settle the question beyond controversy. A servant owed his lord ten thousand talents; he could not pay the debt; he asked to have it remitted, and it was forgiven. His fellow-servant owed him

a hundred pence. He inexorably demanded payment; whereupon his lord said to him: "O thou wicked servant, I forgave thee all that debt, because thou desiredst me: shouldest not thou also have had compassion on thy fellow-servant, even as I had pity on thee? And his lord was wroth, and delivered him to the tormentors, till he should pay all that was due unto him." Suppose the moral of this parable had not been given by the Saviour, could any man have been at a loss for the application? We hazard nothing in saying that no man could miss the meaning and design of the parable, unless warped by dogmatic prejudice. But our Lord gives us the moral; he delivers the lesson: "So likewise shall my heavenly Father do also unto you, if ye from your hearts forgive not every one his brother their trespasses." (Matt. xviii. 23–35.) Do what? to whom? The answers to these questions settle the controversy.

§ 12. Amissibility Shown by the Weakness of Arguments to the Contrary.

The amissibility of grace is shown by the weakness of the arguments advanced against it.

(1) It is said that this doctrine is inconsistent with the divine perfections. Mr. Buck says:

> God, as a being possessed of infinite love, faithfulness, wisdom, and power, can hardly be supposed to suffer any of his people finally to fall into perdition. This would be a reflection on his attributes, and argue him to be worse than a common father. His *love* to his people is unchangeable, and therefore they cannot be the objects of it at one time, and not at another. His *faithfulness* to them and to his promise is not founded on their merit, but on his own will and goodness. This therefore cannot be violated. His *wisdom* foresees every obstacle in the way, and is capable of removing it and of directing them in the right path. It would be a reflection on his wisdom, after choosing a right end, not to choose right means in accomplishing the same. His *power* is insuperable, and is absolutely and perpetually displayed in their preservation and protection.

And this is argument! By just such logic Antinomianism and Universalism are defended. On the same premises Mill and others sustain Dualism or Atheism, as the evils that are in the world are inconsistent with these perfections, so that there must be a good God and a bad one, or none at all! Angels never fell. Adam and Eve never fell. How could they fall unless God wanted them to fall? and how could he want them to fall if he hates sin and loves holiness? But it is useless to expose such sophistry. It is not inconsistent with God's perfections to create

moral intelligences, and to govern them as such. While they conform to his will he will smile upon them; but if they rebel against his authority he will turn to be their enemy. "Are not my ways equal?" says Jehovah, in referring to this very principle of his government, as we have seen. (Ezek. xviii.)

(2) But Calvinists say Christ has engaged to save all that have been given to him in the covenant between the Father and the Son, and his honor is engaged to save them, so that not one of them can be lost. Thus good Dr. Watts:

> Firm as the earth thy gospel stands,
> My Lord, my hope, my trust:
> If I am found in Jesus' hands,
> My soul can ne'er be lost.
> His honor is engaged to save

The meanest of his sheep:
All that his heavenly Father gave
His hands securely keep.
Nor death nor hell shall e'er remove
His favorites from his breast;
In the dear bosom of his love
They must forever rest.

Now there never was any covenant of this sort entered into between the Father and the Son. The Father never did stipulate to give him just so many elect persons—not one more, not one less—as a reward for his redeeming work; and the Son never did stipulate to save just so many, *nolens volens*, or by *making* them willing to be saved, in view of this deposit. That is all a fiction. Christ does indeed speak of certain persons who were given to him by the Father. But who were they? and what was their character? and what became of them? They were his apostles. Thus he says: "I have manifested thy name unto the men thou gavest me out of the world: thine they were, and thou gavest them me, and they have kept thy word." "While I was with them in the world, I kept them in thy name: those that thou gavest me I have kept, and none of them is lost, but the son of perdition; that the scripture might be fulfilled." (John xvii.)

So then it seems one of the twelve, given to the Son by the Father, was lost! Was the honor of Christ engaged to save only eleven out of the twelve? Would not Christ have saved Judas as well as John if he had not fallen by transgression? And what about Peter? was not the honor of Christ as much engaged to save him from apostasy as well as to recover him from it?

Who does not see that Christ's honor was not engaged to save any of the apostles, except as they kept the word of the Father who gave them to him? And so of all others. His honor is engaged to save none who reject his word, or who refuse to believe on him or obey him, or who make shipwreck of faith and put away a good conscience. We "are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation." (1 Pet. i. 5.) Christ says: "My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me: and I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any pluck them out of my hand." That is, while they act as his sheep, listen with docility to his

instructions, he will recognize them as belonging to his flock; and they shall never be destroyed while they remain under their Shepherd's care; neither robber nor wolf can seize them "while by their Shepherd's side." He says: "My Father, which gave them me is greater than all; and no man is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand." (John x. 27–29.) No one has the power to snatch, to seize, to carry them off from under his powerful protection. But to argue from this (as Schaff does in Lange's "Commentary") that believers cannot renounce their faith and perish, is unexegetical, and contrary to Scripture and fact. (1 Tim. i. 19, 20; Hebrews, *passim*.) So the apostle asks, "Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword?" and exclaims, "Nay in all these things we are more than conquerors through him that loved us. For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord." (Rom. viii. 35–39.) But does he say that sin cannot effect a severance? Does he say that they can sin no more? Does he say that they cannot make shipwreck of faith? and that because of unbelief they cannot be broken off from the good olive-tree, severed from the living Vine? He says the contrary over and over, as we have seen. There is no lack of power or faithfulness in either the Father or the Son,

> When any turn from Zion's way—
> Alas! what numbers do!

"Behold, the Lord's hand is not shortened, that it cannot save; neither his ear heavy, that it cannot hear. But your iniquities

have separated between you and your God, and your sins have hid his face from you, that he will not hear." (Isa. lix. 1, 2.)

The promise of eternal life is given to *characters*, not to individuals arbitrarily selected, without foresight of faith or good works. The promise is to the fruitful branches, to the sheep, to believers, to saints; but if these draw back His soul shall have no pleasure in them. The apostle, with all his assurance of salvation, knew very well that it was not to one named Paul that the promise was given, but to a penitent, believing, and obedient follower of

Christ; hence he says: “I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection; lest that by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself should be a castaway.” (1 Cor. ix. 27.) The immutability of God’s nature, developed and illustrated in his moral government of the universe, demands the variation of his conduct toward his subjects according to the variations of their conduct toward him. A thousand passages of the character of those adduced may be cited in favor of the inamissibility of grace, but they are all alike wide of the mark. They prove no such thing. They only prove that eternal life is sure to all who hold fast their profession.

(3) But it is argued that the Holy Spirit can never abandon any whom he has renewed by his grace.

That is a *petitio principii*. Prove this, and the question is settled. But this is the point in controversy, though it seems strange that there should be any controversy about it. Why might not the Holy Spirit forsake any whom he has renewed by his grace? He will not forsake any who are led by him, who concur with his gracious operations. But what if “they rebel and vex his Holy Spirit, so that he is turned to be their enemy?” (Isa. lxiii. 10.) What if they “resist the Holy Ghost” (Acts vii. 51), as God’s ancient people did? What if they “grieve the Holy Spirit of God, by which they were sealed to the day of redemption,” as the apostle warned the Ephesian believers not to do, thereby declaring its possibility? (Eph. iv. 30.) What if they “tread under foot the Son of God, and count the blood of the covenant, wherewith they were sanctified, an unholy thing, and do despite unto the Spirit of grace,” as the apostates did, spoken of in Heb. x. 29? In such cases as these will the Holy Spirit continue to dwell in their hearts? Will the love of God be shed abroad in their hearts by the Holy Ghost? Will the

Spirit bear witness with their spirits that they are the children of God? Will they continue to be sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of a heavenly inheritance? It sounds almost like blasphemy against the Holy Spirit to say such things. “Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?” But the apostle immediately adds, “If any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy; for the temple of God is holy, which temple ye are.” But will the Holy Spirit—the archetype and source of all purity—dwell in a temple defiled with all pollutions? Can he dwell in it, when God destroys it? (*Cf.* 2 Cor.

vi. 16; Ps. li. 11.)

But it is argued that our Lord says: "I will pray the Father and he will give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you forever." (John xiv. 16.) What of that? He only means to say that as he was going away from them his personal presence would be substituted by that of the Paraclete, who was to come into the world to remain with the Church to the end of time. This passage is therefore utterly irrelevant. The Holy Spirit is always in the Church; but individual members have his presence with them so long as they yield themselves up to his gracious influence, and no longer than that. Christ says: "If ye shall keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love," and the Spirit is held by the same tenure. "If a man love me, he will keep my words and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him and will *dwell* with him." (John xiv. 23; xv. 10.) Thus "the whole Trinity descends into our *faithful* hearts." But will not there abide if they prove unfaithful. In many places we are assured that God is faithful, God will not leave us nor forsake us; he will fulfill in us all the good pleasure of his goodness and the work of faith with power; he will preserve us blameless unto the coming of oar Lord Jesus Christ; faithful is he that calleth you, who will do it. But all this is conditioned upon our faithfulness. God forsakes none but those who forsake him. But we read: "If thou forsake him, he will cast thee off forever."

We frequently hear—or at least we used to hear, as we do not hear it so often in these days—that passage in Phil. i. 6 brought forward with a flourish of trumpets, as if it were the end of controversy: "Being confident of this very thing, that he which hath begun a good work in you will perform it until the day of

Jesus Christ." But what does this import? The apostle was persuaded, πεποιθὼς, had a good hope that the Christians at Philippi would persevere in piety to the end of their lives, not because he had any certain revelation concerning them to that effect, not because of any unconditional decree, or irresistible, inamissible grace—of which he knew nothing, as indeed there is no such thing anywhere spoken of in Scripture. He assigns the reason for his persuasion concerning them: "Even as it is meet for me to think this of you all"—it is proper that I should entertain this hope concerning you—"because I have you in my heart; inasmuch as both in my bonds, and in the defense and confirmation of the

gospel, ye all are partakers of my grace." (Verse 7.) Their sincere piety and devotion to the cause of Christ, and their love to the apostle and his love to them warranted this expression of confidence concerning their future course and final salvation.

He used similar language in addressing the Hebrew believers, at the very time he was portraying the danger of apostasy, and warning them against it. "But, beloved, we are persuaded [πεπείσμεθα—a similar word] better things of you, and things that accompany salvation, though we thus speak." But on what was this persuasion founded? On the unconditional decree and the inamissibility of grace? Nay, verily, it was this: "For God is not unrighteous to forget your work and labor of love, which ye have showed toward his name, in that ye have ministered to the saints, and do minister. And we desire that every one of you do show the same diligence, to the full assurance of hope unto the end: that ye be not slothful, but followers of them who through faith and patience inherit the promises." (Heb. vi. 9–12.) So in Heb. x. 39 he expresses a similar confidence: "But we are not of them who draw back unto perdition; but of them that believe to the saving of the soul." Why does he speak thus of them? Simply because, while others had apostatized and forsaken the society of the Christians, they had hitherto proved faithful amid the persecutions. He had good reason to hope well of them, who had done and suffered so much for the cause of Christ. But was he certain that they would persevere to the end? Far from it. It was his fear that they might after all fall away that led him to write this Epistle, which is made up of warnings against apostasy and encouragements to perseverance. "Cast not away therefore your confidence, which hath good recompense

of reward. For ye have need of patience, that after ye have done the will of God, ye might receive the promise." "Now the just shall live by faith, but if he draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him." So he writes to the Philippians, of whom he had good reason to hope well: "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling; for it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure." "Only let your conversation be as it becometh the gospel of Christ; that ye stand fast in one spirit, with one mind striving together for the faith of the gospel." (Phil. i. 27; ii. 12, 13.)

But the great classical text urged against the amissibility of

grace is 1 John iii. 9: “Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him, and he cannot sin, because he is born of God.” The argument is put into this syllogism: He that sinneth not, neither can sin, cannot fall away from his faith; Whosoever is born of God sinneth not, neither can sin; Therefore whosoever is born of God cannot fall away from his faith. Very well, let us try another syllogism: Those who do not and who cannot do the will of God cannot be saved; Whosoever are the children of the devil do not and cannot do the will of God; Therefore whosoever are the children of the devil cannot be saved.

There you have dualism with a witness. This is what is called the two-seed doctrine: the seed of God and the seed of the devil. Their numbers respectively are so definite that they neither can be added unto nor diminished. This ancient heresy, received by an ignorant sect of Antinomians in our own day, is based upon this construction of this text. And where is the flaw in the argument? Our Lord says: “A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit; neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit.” (Matt. vii. 18.) But cannot a child solve this riddle? The plain common sense meaning is that it is contrary to the nature of a good tree to bring forth bad fruit, and of a corrupt tree to bring forth good fruit. So a good man will do good: he must do good while he retains his goodness; and the contrary obtains with the wicked. (1 John v. 18.) This gives no countenance to Manichean dualism, though the Manicheans quoted it to sustain their heresy. The metaphor is not to be pressed beyond the point in hand: whether or not good and bad trees can change their character, it is certain good and bad men can. (Ezek. xviii. 26, 27.)

The whole scope of John’s teaching in this Epistle is to keep good men from becoming bad, and to assure them that they could not he good unless they did good. The seed of the divine nature, while it remained in them, would develop itself in good works, just as the seed of the diabolic nature, while it remains in the children of the devil, develops itself in the works of the devil. The boasted syllogism falls to pieces when you give the passage the common sense interpretation agreeing with the context and the whole scope of the Epistle, namely, While the children of God retain the seed of grace within them they cannot sin, any more than the children of the devil, while they remain subject to his influence, can work

righteousness. Reams of paper have been wasted on this passage, whose very simplicity seams to have confounded the critics. Neither this text nor any other, in the slightest degree, intimates that the holiest man may not withdraw from under the gracious influence of the Holy Spirit, so that He may be vexed and grieved and quenched and despised, and be forced to "take his everlasting flight."

(4) But it is further argued that those who are united in the fellowship of the saints can never be totally or finally lost from that holy society. There are three passages usual]y adduced in proof of this opinion.

First, Acts ii. 47: "And the Lord added to the Church such as should be saved." This is frequently quoted thus: "such as should be eternally saved," or words to that effect. But omitting the words "to the Church," as they are not in the best MSS., the clause reads, literally, "And the Lord added those being saved daily together." As the Authorized Version seems to be no rendering of the clause, and as we do not like to charge the translators with manufacturing the rendering for dogmatic purposes, it is possible that they used this phrase, "such as should be saved," as a clumsy idiom for such as should appear to be saved—such as the apostles might find complying with the exhortation of verse 40: "Save yourselves from this untoward generation." Τοὺς *σωζομὲνους* is the present passive participle of *σὠζω*—to save—and means simply "those being saved." These were added to the disciples by the Lord, by the instrumentality of the apostles, and by the drawing of willing hearts by the Holy Spirit. It is useless to add another word.

The second passage adduced is Acts xiii. 48: "And as many as were ordained to eternal life believed."

But we have elsewhere shown that the clause, literally rendered, is: "And believed, as many as were disposed to eternal life." They were not then ordained to eternal life; they were not foreordained to it. These Gentiles were brought to this determination by availing themselves of the aid of preventing grace and the instructions and exhortations of the apostles, and the like. Being thus disposed to eternal life, or determined on salvation, when Jesus was offered to them as their Saviour they accepted him with joy and gratitude—"they were glad, and glorified the word of the Lord, and believed." They are thus placed in contrast with the contradicting and blaspheming Jews, who, though they were more

favorably circumstanced for salvation than the Gentiles, received the grace of God in vain, and so judged themselves unworthy of eternal life. (Verse 46.) Men sometimes make shipwreck of faith, put away a good conscience, and go back to perdition; but were it otherwise—were faith inamissible, so that if any one truly believes his final salvation is irrevocably determined—this passage contains no such doctrine. We need not add that the generality of critics of the various confessions render it as we have done, and as Webster and Wilkinson, who appear to believe in the inamissibility of grace: "Set in order, or disposed to everlasting life—duly prepared for the reception of the gospel." It has been suggested that the false rendering of the Vulgate may have led Augustin and his followers of the Western Church into the predestinarian construction of the passage, which did not obtain in the Eastern Church, where the original Greek was used. The case of the persons spoken of in this passage is nearly parallel with that of the perverse Jews and of the believers in Acts ii., previously noticed.

The third passage adduced for the purpose in question is 1 John ii. 19: "They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us: but they went out, that they might be made manifest that they were not all of us."

It is astonishing what a flourish is made over this passage, as if it demonstrated the inamissibility of grace—that is, that men who were ever truly united to the people of God would never leave

their society. And yet the Scriptures, as well as daily observation, show that this is constantly taking place. How often are we warned against the forsaking of the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is! (Heb. x. 25.) The apostle had no reference to that in the passage before us. He is warning the brethren—his "little children"—against the deceivers and antichrists, the false teachers who had begun to infect the Church. These were the Docetic and Cerinthian heretics who denied the proper humanity of Christ. (1 John iv. 1–3; 2 John 7.) These antichrists, if they ever were sound in the faith, as they may have been at first, had lapsed into error—the grievous error of denying that "Christ had come in the flesh." As a matter of course, they would continue no longer with the true ministers of Christ; if they had not gone out from them the apostle would have cast them out (2 John 7–11); whereas if they had

remained sound in the faith they would doubtless have continued in the communion of the apostle and those who with him adhered to the truth. Instead of inculcating the notion that those who are once associated with the faithful in the belief of the truth can never be perverted and seduced from their communion, this passage with the context proves the very reverse. The apostle knew that the intellect can be seduced to error as well as the affections to vice, hence his oft-repeated and earnest fatherly warnings to his "little children" against those heretics who, having been themselves decoyed into error, were sedulously and stealthily endeavoring to decoy others.

In the foregoing discussion we have answered every argument professedly drawn from Scripture in opposition to the doctrine of the amissibility of grace.

§ 13. Flavel's Four Grounds Considered.

Mr. Flavel lays down four grounds "of the saints' perseverance."

1. God's electing love, in which they are given to Christ. (John x. 29.) We have seen that there never was any such election—never such a gift.

2. The immortal nature of sanctifying grace (John iv. 14; 1 John iii. 9): that though there "are declinings of grace in the saints" (Rev. ii. 4), yet grace cannot be totally or finally lost, for the seed of God remaineth in the sanctified. We have shown

what a begging of the question this is, and what a palpable contradiction of the Scripture and observation.

3. The covenant of grace. (Jer. xxxii. 40.) "And I will make an everlasting covenant with them, that I will not turn away from them, to do them good; but I will put my fear in their hearts, that they shall not depart from me." But a reference to that chapter will show that it refers to the return of the children of Israel from captivity, and the renewal of the covenant which was made with their fathers. The design was to make them a holy people: whether that design was answered in all cases let history testify. We have shown that in all God's covenant transactions with men he engages to do his part and requires them to do theirs: "They shall be my people, and I will be their God." (Verse 38; *cf.* 2 Cor. vi. 14; vii. 1.)

4. Christ's effectual intercession. (Luke xxii. 32.) "But I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not." This we have shown argues that there was a possibility of Peter's faith failing, while it does not prove that all are infallibly saved for whom the Saviour intercedes. His intercession does not override the moral agency and responsibility of any man. There is not a sinner in hell for whom the Saviour did not intercede. We are commanded to pray for all men, and all our prayers are presented by our Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous; so that they are in effect his intercessions; but are all men saved in consequence? or does the probation of a man cease the moment he is converted? It does if it is impossible for him to fall; he is no longer on trial. But do not the Scriptures everywhere teach that probation continues while life lasts? And if so grace cannot be inamissible.

§ 14. The Full Assurance of Hope.

It might be supposed that we should notice the argument sometimes adduced for the inamissibility of grace, that it is so comforting a doctrine. It affords so much joy to have the full assurance of our final salvation.

We answer that this has nothing to do with the argument. And if it were so that the doctrine is adapted to afford comfort, we might reply that Universalists say the same thing in regard to their doctrine of universal salvation, and that papists affirm the same of their priestly pardons, indulgences, etc. There may be false as well as true grounds of comfort. But the assurance of

salvation spoken of in the Scripture, so far as it refers to individuals, is restricted to the present state. "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God." "Beloved, now are we the sons of God." As to the future, we can attain to nothing more than the full assurance of hope. That is all that we need; that is all that can be of service to us. This animates us, stimulates us to duty, supports us under trial. "And every man that hath this hope in him, purifieth himself, even as he is pure." There can be no lack of comfort, solid comfort, when there is this hope as an anchor of the soul, sure and steadfast, entering into that within the veil. It is all our present state will safely bear. It leaves room for that fear of

caution and circumspection and modesty which is so necessary to keep us humble and obedient, and consequently happy; for as the wise man says: “Happy is the man that feareth always.” As a matter of fact, experience, and observation, the apostles and primitive Christians, who all believed in the amissibility of grace, were the happiest men that ever lived; and those who most nearly resemble them in our days are those who firmly believe the same doctrine, namely, that saints may fall, totally and finally fall; or that they may fall and rise again; or that by watchfulness and diligence in performing the conditions prescribed they may never fall, but make their calling and election sure, “for so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.”

§ 15. Short and Easy Settlement of the Controversy.

But there is a short and easy method of settling this controversy. The amissibility of grace is set forth in every way in which truth is inculcated in the Holy Scriptures. The plain, unequivocal, and manifold testimonies of the Scriptures to this doctrine agree with all we know of the divine character and government and with our own experience and observation. Therefore, if there be any passages of scripture which seem to teach the inamissibility of grace, they must be so interpreted (if interpreted at all), as to harmonize them with the general unequivocal teaching of the Scriptures and our conceptions of the character and government of God and our own experience and observation.

Book VII.
Ecclesiology: the Doctrine of the Church, Its Sacraments and Ministry.

I. Of the Church. (Article XIII.)
II. Of Purgatory. (Article XIV.)
III. Of Speaking in the Congregation in Such a Tongue as the People Understand. (Article XV.)
IV. Of the Sacraments. (Article XVI.)
V. Of Baptism. (Article XVII.)
VI. Of the Lord’s-supper. (Article XVIII.)
VII. Of Both Kinds. (Article XIX.)
VIII. Of the One Oblation of Christ Finished upon the Cross. (Article XX.)
IX. Of the Marriage of Ministers. (Article XXI.)
X. Of the Rites and Ceremonies of Churches. (Article XXII.)

Part I.

Article XIII.
Of the Church.

213

The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in which the pure Word of God is preached, and the sacraments duly administered, according to Christ's ordinance, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same.

Introduction.

This article corresponds to Article XIX. of the Anglican Confession, except that the latter has "the which," and "be duly administered:" the "be" in ours was probably omitted by a typographical mistake; the word "are" should be supplied. Then the Anglican Article has this addition: "As the Church of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch have erred, so also the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith:" in the Latin, *agenda* and *credenda*. This is a strong statement, very damaging to the Romish Church, which is here charged with errors in morals, worship, and faith. Easy enough is it to make this charge good. Look at the impious casuistry of the Jesuits; look at the mummeries and idolatrous rites and ceremonies which make up so large a part of Romish worship. Look at the new dogmas decreed by councils and enforced by popes, especially the twelve articles added by Pius IV. to the Apostles' Creed—all of them erroneous; and the two dogmas added by Pius IX.—equally false and absurd. Yet this corrupt communion is called a "Church," as are the fallen communions of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch, because they still hold to the Apostles' Creed, and indeed to the Holy Scriptures; albeit it is to be feared that they make the word of God of none effect, in many instances, by their traditions. But, as they baptized into

214

the Creed of Christendom, the Reformers recognized the validity of

their baptism, and were never rebaptized themselves, nor did they rebaptize others who had been baptized by papists. We very properly indorse their views. We may admit that the Romish communion is a Christian Church, while we separate from it as extremely corrupt. There seemed to be no necessity, however, for putting this into the Confession, and so Mr. Wesley properly omitted it. The article seems to have been derived from the Seventh Article of the Augsburg Confession, which reads thus:

> They likewise teach that there will always be one holy Church. The Church is the congregation of the saints, in which the gospel is correctly taught and the sacraments are properly administered. And for the true unity of the Church nothing more is required than agreement concerning the doctrines of the gospel and the administration of the sacraments. Nor is it necessary that the same human traditions—that is, rites and ceremonies instituted by men—should be everywhere observed. As Paul says, "One faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all," etc.

The reference to rites and ceremonies is copied into our Twenty-second Article. It ought not to be in the article on the Church.

The Augsburg Article needed qualifying, and it is qualified in our article. Our article is not very happily worded. "The Church"—"The visible Church of Christ"—seems to denote the same as "the holy Catholic Church, the communion of saints," in the Creed, where it comprehends all who have been baptized and have not forsaken the Christian cause. And yet when it speaks of "a congregation of faithful men," and specifies "the Church of Jerusalem, Alexandria, Antioch, and Rome," it seems to refer to a particular Church. Litton attempts to remove the difficulty by translating the Latin *Ecclesia Christi visibilis*, "A visible Church," forgetting that, as Burnet says, "the articles of our Church were at the same time prepared both in Latin and English, so that they both are equally authenticated." Perhaps, as Wesley intimates, it was designed to embrace both, a particular Church and the Church Catholic.

Chapter I.
The Church: Its Scriptural Idea.

§ 1. The Distinction of Visible and Invisible.

215
By speaking of "the visible Church," the article seems to imply that there is *an invisible Church.*

By this is not meant, as some hold, the Church triumphant in heaven (which is invisible to us) as contrasted with the Church militant on earth, though there is a sense in which our brethren in Paradise are members of "the holy Catholic Church, the communion of saints."

One army of the living God,
To his command we bow;
Part of his host have crossed the flood.
And part are crossing now.

But the Catholic Church on earth is one body; in one sense visible, and in another sense invisible. All who profess and call themselves Christians, having been baptized in the name of Christ, are members of the Church as it is visible; but only those who are sincere believers—*coetus fidelium*—are members of the Church as it is invisible. What the apostle says of the Jew, *mutatis mutandis*, may be said of the Christian: "For he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision, which is outward in the flesh: but he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God." (Rom. ii. 28, 29.)

§ 2. Membership in the Visible and Invisible Churches.

Though all the members of the invisible Church may be members of the visible Church, yet all the members of the visible Church are not members of the invisible. This is taught us by our Lord in the parables of the field of wheat and tares, the net of good

fishes and bad, etc. (Matt. xiii.) It does not follow that gross offenders are not to be excommunicated because we cannot distinguish the wheat from the tares, or, if the distinction

can be made, cannot always separate the one from the other. The field is a wheat-field, though tares may grow in it. There was a Judas in the Apostolic College, and his true character was known to the Saviour long before it was known to the traitor's associates. So Ananias and Sapphira, Simon Magus, and other unworthy persons who did not belong to the invisible Church were for awhile members of the visible Church, till they were detected and disowned by the apostles.

§ 3. Salvation Without the Pale of the Church.

It is not meant, when it is asserted that all who belong to the invisible Church are members of the visible Church, that all who have not been incorporated into the visible Church by baptism are excluded from the favor of God and the kingdom of grace and glory. All infants are in the favor of God and are entitled to membership in the visible Church, and, dying in infancy, will be sure to enter into the kingdom of glory. The same may be said of Jews, Turks, and heathen, and ill-instructed persons in Christendom, who improve the light and grace afforded them. This is in accordance with reason and Scripture. (Rom. ii. 14, 15.) They are accepted by God for the sake of Christ who died for them and whose Spirit is imparted to them, though they have never heard of the Saviour's name, and of course could not believe in him and be baptized. They have never rejected him, and they evince such a disposition as would induce them to receive him as their Saviour, like the man in the gospel, who, when asked, "Dost thou believe on the Son of God?" answered and said, "Who is he Lord, that I might believe on him?" and when he was made acquainted with him said, "Lord, I believe!" (John ix.) Such persons, including infants, are sometimes called virtual members of the Church, both visible and invisible. But the term Church, as used in the New Testament, scarcely allows of such a latitude. "We openly affirm," says the French Confession, "that where the Word of God is not received, where there is no profession of faith and administration of the sacraments, there, properly

speaking, we cannot affirm that there is any Church." "We do not," says Melancthon, "as some cavilers affirm, dream of a Platonic republic: as we say that the Church is an existing reality; and we assign the notes of it—the word and the sacraments."

217

On this question, however, there has been a great war of words, into which it would be unprofitable for us to enter. It began with the Fathers, who were inconsistent with themselves, as they would sometimes allow salvation to well-disposed heathens, who were in invincible ignorance, and yet maintain that none could be saved outside the pale of the Church and the profession of the orthodox creed. Thus Cyprian says the Church is the mother of all God's children; it is like Noah's ark, in which all who would be saved must take refuge. From him was derived the maxim: *Habere jam non potest Deum Patrem qui ecclesiam non habet matrem*: "None can have God for a Father who has not the Church for a mother." Hence the damnatory clauses of the Athanasian Creed and the Creed of Pope Pius IV., and similar shocking and impious deliverances of Protestants, as well as Papists, for which, it need scarcely be said, there is not the slightest authority in the Scripture.

§ 4. Signification of the Term Church in the Scriptures.

The word ἐκκλησία occurs one hundred and fifteen times in the New Testament (counting Acts ii. 47, where it may be an interpolation, as it is not in the best MSS. or in the Revised Version). In three places (Acts xix. 32, 39, 41) it is properly rendered "assembly," as it refers to a popular assemblage of citizens of Ephesus. In two places (Acts vii. 38 and Heb. ii. 12) it refers to the congregation of Israel, the Hebrew *kahal* being frequently rendered ἐκκλησία in the Septuagint. In the other one hundred and ten cases it refers to the Church of Christ, though with various modifications of meaning. It is thought by some to refer in Eph. v. 27 to the Church triumphant in heaven; but the word is used six times in this paragraph, where the relation between husband and wife is compared to the relation between Christ and his Church: the Church is subject to Christ, who is the Head of the Church; Christ loved the Church, and gave himself for it; he sanctifies it, cherishes it, to the intent that he might present it to himself a glorious

Church, perfectly holy. That is what the Church should be, though as a body it never will be, in the present state. Hence the ideal Church is the Church after having passed through the sanctifying process specified, so that it shall be presented faultless before the presence of his glory with exceeding joy. Thus the militant Church, separated

from all unworthy members and freed from all imperfections, will be developed and consummated into the Church triumphant, holy and without blemish.

In Heb. xii. 23 we read of the "Church of the first-born, which are written in heaven." These Bloomfield identifies with "the spirits of just men made perfect;" and so the Church here is the Church triumphant. Macknight considers them the pious Hebrews of the Old Testament, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and others, as in Heb. xi. Whitby considers them the apostles and first believers, as in Rom. viii. 23. Stuart understands it of "those who had been most distinguished for piety and usefulness, such as patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs," etc. The spirits of the just made perfect, he says, are those who are "exalted to a state of final reward, having completed their probation and arrived at their mature state—viz., a final state of glory." Webster and Wilkinson perhaps give the sense:

> The Church mystical, who are what they profess to be, and are entitled to a share of the privileges of elder sons. (Luke x. 20; Phil. iv. 3; Rev. xxi. 27.) Πρωτοτόκων, a title of the natural Israel (Ex. iv. 22, 23; *cf.* xix. 5; Deut. xxxii. 8, 9), here transferred to the spiritual πρωτοτόκοι, *quorum nomina in tabulos civium coeli relata, Christiani ridentur forsan iidem de quibus.* (Apoc. xiv. 4; xx. 4.) The spirits of the just made perfect are those who have attained the consummation of bliss.

This "Church mystical" is what is meant by the "invisible Church." Of course when we join the visible Church, we are come to the invisible Church, which is comprehended in the visible. In no other place, it is believed, is the invisible Church distinguished from the visible.

The word "Church" is of uncertain origin. It is generally derived from Anglo-Saxon *circ*, pronounced as the Scotch *kirk*, and with variations in other Northern languages, from the Greek κυριακή, κυριακόν, the Lord's house, from κυριακός, concerning a lord. Other derivatives may be seen in McClintock and Strong's Cyclopedia. But this is of little importance. It is absurdly used for

ἱερόσυλος in Acts xix. 37, where the Authorized Version has "robbers of churches." In all other places it stands for ἐκκλησία. This word comes from ἐκκλέω, to call out. The Greeks used the word ἐκκλησία for an assembly of the citizens called out to consider matters of public interest. (Acts xix.) Words are generally corrupted by use, and so ἐκκλησία was sometimes used to

designate any assembly, however convened—*e. g.*, the mob at Ephesus. (Acts xix. 32.) In the Septuagint ἐκκλησία is used seventy times for the Hebrew *kahal*, which is from the verb meaning to call together, and designates a convocation or assembly or congregation, as of the Israelites convened for any purpose, especially for religious worship. (Deut. xviii. 16; Ps. xxii. 22; *cf.* Heb. ii. 12; Acts vii. 38.) So 1 Macc. ii. 56: "Caleb, for bearing witness before the congregation [ἐκκλησία] received the heritage of the land." (*Cf.* iv. 59.) As the kindred word *synagogue* is used to denote not only the assembly, but also the place in which it met, so the word church is also used in that sense. It is thought by many that ἐκκλησία is so used in 1 Cor. xi. 18–22; xiv. 23; but others think it there denotes, as usual, the assembly itself.

§ 5. New Testament Uses Discriminated.

According to the analogy of *kahal*, ἐκκλησία in the New Testament, excluding the exceptions noted, denotes: (1) The Catholic Church, ideally considered as a congregation, but really a society—*congregation* being rather a property of it, in its subaltern constituencies. It is a society, made up of all the particular Churches in the world, and by them made visible. It is used in this sense in the first of the two passages in which it is used in the Gospels, Matt. xvi. 18: "Upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it," that is, it shall never be destroyed; it shall be an immortal society. So in 1 Cor. xii. 28, Eph. i. 22; iii. 10, 21; Col. i. 18, 24; 1 Tim. iii. 15, and other places. (2) The aggregate of all the particular Churches in a city is called the Church of that city. (Acts viii. 1, 3; xi. 22, 26; 1 Cor. i. 2; xiv. 34; Rev. i.; ii.; iii.) (3) A particular congregation or society of Christians, worshiping statedly in one place. It seems to denote this in the other place in the Gospels, where it is used twice. (Matt.

xviii. 17.) It is so used in Rom. xvi. 3, 5, 1 Cor. xvi. 19; Col. iv. 15; Phil. i. 2.

In the New Testament the word is never used in the singular to denote the Church of a nation, state, or province, as we say the Church of Rome, England, Scotland, etc.: it is always "the Churches of Galatia" (1 Cor. xvi. 1; Gal. i. 2); "the Churches of Asia" (1 Cor. xvi. 19); "the Churches of Macedonia" (2 Cor. viii. 1); "the Churches of Judea" (Gal. i. 22). Of course there is nothing like what we call "denominational Churches," as Lutheran, Calvinist, Episcopal, Presbyterian, Methodist, Baptist, etc.

§ 6. Sense of the Term in the Article, Catechism, and Apostles' Creed.

220

As already intimated, our Article may have been worded in a somewhat general way, so as to embrace both a particular Church and the Church Catholic. However, the Church Catholic is principally meant, made visible by the particular Churches of which it is constituted. The word "congregation" therefore means "society," as *kahal* is frequently used in speaking of the whole people of Israel, whether assembled or not. It implies, however, that this society has its congregations or assemblies for divine worship, as here specified. This is what is meant by the Wesleyan Catechism when it defines the Church as "the whole body of true believers in every age and place," since it goes on to specify preaching the word and ministering the sacraments, and says "baptized persons are made members of the visible Church," thus embracing not only believers, but also their children, being baptized. In the Apostles' Creed the Church is styled "The holy catholic Church, the communion of saints." This is the visible, as well as the invisible, Church.

[In harmony with the foregoing, Dr. Pope remarks:

> The term catholic means universal; and when local is added, as its counterpart, the two expressions signify that the one Church of the Redeemer, his body on earth, has such a universality in its design and destiny as is consistent with the local independence of individual Churches. . . . The Christian Church may be regarded as *catholic*: designed and adapted for universal diffusion; and embracing the totality of those communions which maintain the truths in which the essence of Christianity

lies. The term, therefore, ought never to be used of any particular community. The Church is also *local* or *particular*: it exists in independent and even isolated forms, whether as it respects individual or connectional or national bodies; and it may, holding the catholic verities, maintain in its confession truths that are not catholic, and adopt uncatholic usages, without impairing its catholicity. For the one Church of Christ is at once adapted for every variety of mankind, and influenced in its turn by every variety of human life. It is not more certainly Universal than it is Particular.[1]

Catholicity is, of course, a true predicate of the invisible Church. But, in the following chapter, will be declared at large in what sense the Church is at once both visible, or particular, and catholic, or universal. At the same time, the confusion which characterizes many of the Protestant Confessions will be brought under notice, together with the positive errors into which Greeks, Latins, and Anglicans have fallen.]

---

1. Pope, “Compendium,” etc., Vol. III., pp. 282–284.↩

Chapter II.
The Church as Catholic and Visible.

§ 1. Confusion of the Protestant Confessions.

221

Luther in his Larger Catechism says: “I believe that there is upon earth a certain community of saints, composed solely of holy persons; under one Head, collected together by the Spirit; of one faith, and one mind, endowed with manifold gifts; but united in love, and without sects or divisions.” We may well ask, “Where shall we wander now to find such a community?” The property which belongs exclusively to the invisible Church is here loosely predicated of the visible Church.

The Augsburg Confession in the Seventh Article, already cited, says:

> There will always be one holy Church. The Church is the congregation of the saints, in which the gospel is correctly taught and the sacraments are properly administered. And for the true unity of the church nothing more is required than agreement concerning the doctrines of the gospel and the administration of the sacraments.

This is less objectionable than Luther’s definition, but it is obvious that there never was a catholic Church answering to this description.

The Helvetic Confession (1566) says:

> The Church is a community of believers or saints, gathered out of the world, whose distinction it is to know and to worship, through the word and by the Spirit, the true God in Christ our Saviour, and by faith to participate in all the blessings freely given to us through Christ. These are all citizens of one polity, subjects of the same Lord under the same laws, and recipients of the same spiritual blessings. It is concerning them that the Article of the Creed, “I believe in the holy catholic Church,” is to be understood.

The Belgic Confession is like it:

> The catholic Church is the community of all true believers—viz., those who hope in Christ alone for salvation and are sanctified by his Spirit. It is not attached to any one place or limited to particular persons, the members

of it being dispersed throughout the world.

The Polish Confession says:

There are particular Churches and the Church universal. The true universal

Church is the community of all believers dispersed throughout the world, who are and who remain one catholic Church so long as they are united by subjection to one Head, Christ, by the indwelling of one Spirit and the profession of the same faith; and this though they be not associated in one common external polity, but, as regards external fellowship and ecclesiastical regimen, be not in communion with each other.

Nowell's Catechism, which is of semi-symbolical authority in the Church of England, defines the Church thus: "The Church is the universal society of all the faithful whom God predestinated from eternity to everlasting life through Christ." This is the invisible catholic Church of the Creed; but the Catechism says:

There is however, also, a visible Church of God—a certain society of persons, wherever they may be, who profess the pure doctrine of Christ, and celebrate the sacraments as the word of God directs. These are the indispensable notes of a Church, but if the Church be in a healthy condition, it will also exhibit the exercise of discipline.

The Sixty-eighth Article of the Dublin Convocation (1615) says:

There is but one catholic Church (out of which there is no salvation), containing the universal company of all the saints that ever were, are, or shall be, gathered together in one body, under one Head—Christ Jesus—part whereof is already in heaven triumphant, part as yet militant here upon earth. And because this Church consisteth of all those, and those alone, which are elected by God unto salvation, and regenerated by the power of his Spirit, the number of whom is known only unto God himself, therefore it is called the catholic, or universal, and the invisible Church,

In the following articles "particular and visible Churches, many in number," are recognized.

These Reformed Confessions make the catholic Church invisible. This, indeed, is explicitly stated in the Scotch Confession, which defines the Church as

A society of the elect of all ages and countries, both Jews and Gentiles —this is the catholic or universal Church. Those who are members of it worship God in Christ and enjoy fellowship with him through the Spirit. This Church is invisible, known only to God, who alone knows who are his, and comprehends both the departed in the Lord and the elect upon earth.

The relation which this sustains to the Calvinistic doctrine of absolute, unconditional election is obvious. Dr. John Owen says that David alluded to the members of this Church of the elect in Ps. cxxxix. 16: “In thy book all my members were written, which in continuance were fashioned, when as yet there was none of them.” To what length will not a fanatical attachment to an erroneous dogma carry one?

§ 2. Greek, Roman, and High-church Errors.

223

On the other hand, the Greek Church says in its Catechism: “The Church is a divinely instituted community of men, united by the orthodox faith, the law of God, the hierarchy, and the sacraments.” This definition “excludes all separatists who either do not receive the divine word at all, or mix with it their own absurd opinions”—that is, all who are not of the orthodox faith, namely, all who are not members of the Greek Church.

The Council of Trent does the same thing in regard to all who are not of the “Roman obedience.” Bellarmin says: “The Church is a society of men, united by a profession of the same Christian faith and a participation of the same sacraments, under the government of lawful pastors, and especially of the one vicar of Christ upon earth, the Roman pontiff.”

The High-church Anglicans follow the example of the Greek and Roman Churches, only they substitute for the orthodox faith and hierarchy of the former, and the lawful pastors and Roman pontiffs of the other, “bishops and priests, assisted by deacons, in regular succession from the apostles.” “Of this one society there cannot be two branches in one and the same place opposed to each other, either in discipline or in doctrine.” (See Hook’s “Church Dictionary,” Art. Church.) This excludes every Christian “society” in Great Britain except the Anglican.

§ 3. The True View of the Church, Visible and Catholic.

In opposition to these conflicting, arrogant, and exclusive views, we hold with Gieseler, “Church History,” Vol. 1., § 1:

If we judge of the various Churches into which Christendom is divided, by their conforming in all respects to the principles and requirements of the Gospel, we cannot allow that any one of them is the perfect representative of that ideal state at which they all aim; nor, on the other hand, can we entirely deny the name of a Christian Church to any one which professes to be built on the Gospel of Christ. They have all so much in common in this religious faith and life, and so much which distinguishes them from all other religious societies, as to justify us in considering them as one whole, and calling them, in a wide sense, "The Christian Church."

A recent writer in the "Contemporary Review" says: "A universal religion, starting with individual faith, but adding immediately an obligation to confess that faith and to proselytize, is already (according to the Protestant definition) a Church."

224

In the "Form of Presbyterian Church Government," adopted by the Westminster Assembly of Divines, it is stated:

There is one general Church visible held forth in the New Testament. (1 Cor. xii.)

The ministry, oracles, and ordinances of the New Testament were given by Jesus Christ to the general Church visible, for the gathering and perfecting of it in this life until his second coming. (1 Cor. xii.; Eph. iv.)

Particular visible Churches, members of the general Church, are also held forth in the New Testament. Particular Churches, in the primitive times, were made up of visible saints—viz., of such as being of age, professed faith in Christ, and obedience unto Christ, according to the rules of faith and hope taught by Christ and his apostles, and of their children. (Acts ii, 38–41, and verse last compared with v. 14; 1 Cor. i. 3, compared with 2 Cor. ix. 13; Acts ii. 39; 1 Cor. vii. 14; Rom. ix. 16 and so forward; Mark x. 14, compared with Matt. xix. 13, 14; Luke xviii. 15, 16.)

This is compatible with the true doctrine of a catholic, visible Church.

Augustin opposed the Donatists for asserting that to predicate catholicity of the Church it is necessary that it should have subjective purity in its members, and that so soon as it allows unworthy persons to remain within its pales it ceases to be catholic. This error, which crops out in every age, arises from confounding the visible with the invisible Church, as already noted. Augustin was not very clear on this subject; he says: "Many, by partaking of the sacrament, are with the Church, and yet are not *in* the Church." What he means is that they are in the visible, but not in the invisible Church, as he says: "Those who appear to be in the

Church, and contradict Christ, therefore do not belong to that Church which is called the body of Christ;" that is, the mystical, invisible Church.

Litton partakes of Augustin's obscurity; he speaks of the *true* Church in distinction from the *visible* Church, and dwells much upon this distinction; and yet he says a true Christian society is a *true* Church visible, if it has the word and sacraments, which forces him to explain that it is called "*true*, not in the sense in which the invisible Church is true, but because the true means of salvation are therein dispensed." This ambiguity is unfortunate. There is great danger of leaning toward Donatism in opposing Romanism.

Chapter III.
The Notes of the Church.

§ 1. Notes Enumerated by the Reformers.

225

The second part of the "Homily for Whitsunday," set forth under Elizabeth, says:

> The true Church is a universal congregation or fellowship of God's faithful and elect people, built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ being the head corner-stone. (Eph. ii.) And it hath always these rites whereby it is known: pure and sound doctrine, the sacraments ministered according to Christ's holy institution, and the right use of ecclesiastical discipline.

The Catechism of Edward VI. says:

> The marks of the Church are, first, pure preaching of the gospel; then, brotherly love; thirdly, upright and uncorrupted use of the Lord's sacraments, according to the ordinance of the gospel; last of all, brotherly correction and excommunication, or banishing those out of the Church that will not amend themselves: this mark the holy fathers termed discipline.

So Bishop Ridley, only he has "charity" in the place of "brotherly love"—meaning perhaps the same.

Nowell's Catechism has "sound doctrine and right use of the sacraments, and then the use of just discipline."

Litton observes: "The Protestant says, in general, the Church (or a part of it) is then where the word and sacraments are, and the society in which the one is preached and the other administered is a legitimate part of the visible Catholic Church." He adds: "Some formularies—*e. g.*, the Scotch Confession, Art. xviii.—add the exercise of discipline; and, indeed, this does seem to be nearly as essential as the notes specified in our Article."

Bishop Browne remarks:

> It is probable that the compilers of the articles, who elsewhere made this use of the keys one note of the Church, omitted it in the article itself, as considering that it was implied in the due administration of the sacraments. For what is the power of the keys and the observance of discipline but the admission of some to and the rejection of others from the

sacraments and blessing of the Church? Where, therefore, the sacraments are duly ministered there too discipline must exist.

226

Mr. Wesley says:

According to the definition in this article, those congregations in which the pure word of God (a strong expression) is not preached are no parts either of the Church of England or the Church Catholic; as neither are those in which the sacraments are not duly administered. I will not undertake to defend the accuracy of this definition. I dare not exclude from the Church Catholic all those congregations in which any unscriptural doctrines which cannot be affirmed to be "the pure word of God," are sometimes, yea, frequently, preached; neither all those congregations in which the sacraments are not duly administered. Certainly, if these things are so, the Church of Rome is not so much as a part of the Catholic Church; seeing therein neither is "the pure word of God" preached, nor the sacraments "duly administered." Whoever they are that have "one Spirit, one hope, one Lord, one faith, one God and Father of all," I can easily bear with their holding wrong opinions, yea, and superstitious modes of worship; nor would I on these accounts scruple still to include them within the pale of the Catholic Church; neither would I have any objection to receive them, if they desired it, as members of the Church of England.

On the other hand Bishop Browne well says:

The expression is not "the word of God is purely preached," but "the pure word of God is preached." If the former words had been used, we might have doubted in what body of Christians God's word was always purely preached, with no mixture of falsehood or error. But "the pure word of God" is preached wherever the main doctrines of the gospel are preserved and taught.

He proceeds to specify the Apostles' Creed as their exponent—all Christians agreeing in that symbol. But when he goes on to say that none are allowed to preach the word or administer the sacraments but "bishops and presbyters," he indorses the arrogant exclusiveness of High-church Anglicans, who repudiate the ministrations of all who are not episcopally ordained.

He cites Luther, Calvin, and other continental Reformers, as well as the English Reformers, as holding that the Roman communion is a Church—a part of the Catholic Church, though fallen and corrupt. Hence they all maintained the validity of Romish baptism, as do we. None of the Reformers were rebaptized. Notwithstanding the arrogance and bigotry of High-church Anglicans and Papists, they recognize the validity of the baptism of

those whom they stigmatize as schismatics and heretics, though they inconsistently repudiate their ordinations, as the Romanists repudiate the Anglican ordinations, and the Greeks repudiate all others but their own. It would seem that the farther men are removed from the true doctrine and ordinances of the Church, the more arrogant and exclusive they are.

§ 2. Cardinal Bellarmin's Notes.

227

Cardinal Bellarmin has gone the greatest length in arrogant exclusiveness. He excludes from all claim to the character of a Church every Christian Society which lacks any one of the following fifteen "Notes of the Church:" "Catholicity, antiquity, duration, amplitude, episcopal succession, apostolical agreement, unity, sanctity of doctrine, efficacy of doctrine, holiness of life, miracles, prophecy, admission of adversaries, unhappy end of enemies, and temporal felicity." It is obvious that these "Notes" were made to order. By the tricks of legerdemain they are made to accord with the character of the Roman communion, which is thus *demonstrated* to be the Catholic Church. But we look in vain for these Notes of the Church of Christ, either in Scripture, or in the history of the Church. Those of these "Notes" which are indicated in the Scripture and the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed—*e. g.*, "unity, holiness, catholicity, and apostolicity," and several others, are the very attributes in which the Roman Communion is glaringly deficient.

§ 3. Catholicity.

The first note named by Bellarmin is catholicity. This is indeed a characteristic of the Church, both visible and invisible. The word "catholic" was not in the earliest creeds. In the symbols of Tertullian, Jerome, and other Occidental creeds, it was simply "holy church." But it is found in the ancient Oriental creeds, as that of Jerusalem, expounded by Cyril, and that of Alexandria, as in the Epistle of Alexander, Archbishop of Alexandria; so in the confession of Arius and his party, presented to Constantine, and in both the creeds delivered by Epiphanius. It is in the Nicene and Niceno-

Constantinopolitan Creeds. Many soon put it in the Latin Creeds. It was added to that of Rufinus. Augustin has: "*Credimus et sanctam ecclesiam, utique catholicam*: We believe in the holy Church, certainly Catholic." It is in the Creed of Eusebius of Gaul, Peter Chrysologus, Alcuin, and other Latins; and it is in all modern recensions of the Creed, as incorporated in liturgies, catechisms, and the like. The word indeed is not found in the New Testament; but it is the designation of the Epistles of James, Peter, Jude, and the first Epistle of John, usually rendered "general." Pearson says:

> This catholicism of the Church consisteth generally in universality, as embracing all sorts of persons, as to be disseminated through all nations, as comprehending all ages, as containing all necessary and saving truths, as obliging all conditions of men to all kinds of obedience, as curing all diseases, and planting all graces in the souls of men.

So Cyril explains this note of the Church, and correctly, if the language is duly guarded. But the prominent idea is that of universal extension. Catholicity is, moreover, in the constitution of the Church, as it is adapted to all nations, kindreds, peoples, and tongues; and it is set forth in prophecy as a certain realization in the future. It was organized to embrace the world, and it shall embrace it. "And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom shall be an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him." (Dan. vii. 27. *Cf.* Ps. ii. 8; Mark xvi. 15; Luke xxiv. 47.)

McClintock and Strong ("Cyclopedia," Art. Catholic) say:

> In the primitive Church the title Catholic came into use at an early period, to distinguish the Christian Church from the Jewish, which was national, while the Christian body was to include all mankind. At a later period it was used to distinguish those who adopted the so-called heresies within the Christian Church from the body of believers who held the true faith, and to whom alone, and to whose belief the term Catholic was applied.

Eusebius ("Ecclesiastical History," iv. 15) gives a letter from the Church at Smyrna, containing an account of the martyrdom of Polycarp, its Bishop, in which the word is used in the sense of universal, as it is in the English liturgy: "The Church of God at Smyrna to that of Philometius, and to all parts of the holy Catholic Church everywhere, mercy, etc., be multiplied." So in the Stromata

(vii.) of Clement of Alexandria.

The Church, therefore, is well styled Catholic, both as it is visible and invisible. As it is invisible, it is known only to God; as it is visible, it is made so by its particular constituencies. Every member of it may call himself a Catholic, as Pacianus (A.D. 372) in answer to Sempronian, the Novatian, who asked him why Christians called themselves Catholics: "Christian is my name, and Catholic my surname; the one is my title, the other my character or mark of distinction." So every particular Church might call itself a Catholic Church, meaning a constituent of the visible Church, which is called Catholic. But it is

absurd for any so-called national or denominational, connectional or particular Church to call itself "the Catholic Church." One knows not which most to admire, the absurdity or the arrogance of such an assumption. McClintock and Strong well say:

> It is bad enough in the Church of Rome to make this claim of the title Catholic: it is still worse for Protestants to concede it. The result of this concession, in most Protestant countries, is that common people have really no conception of the true use of the word Catholic. The words Papist, Papal, Romanist, are all properly applicable to the Church of Rome, and imply no offensive meaning, as they are all legitimately derived. At all events, the Roman should always be prefixed to Catholic, if the latter term be used as part of the title of the Church of Rome.

For the Roman or any other communion to call itself "the Catholic Church" is as much as to say the part is equal to the whole. Barrow (on the "Pope's Supremacy," iii. 201) well says:

> Divers prevalent bodies did assume to themselves the name of Catholic, and the Roman Church particularly hath appropriated that word to itself, even so as to commit a bull, implying Rome and the universe to be the same place; and the perpetual canting of this term hath been one of the most effectual charms to weak people. "I am a Catholic, that is, a universal; therefore all I hold is true"—this is their great argument.

Papists not only claim that their Church is catholic in regard to extension and exclusion, but also in regard to orthodox belief. Old Bishop Bilson, in his "True Difference between Christian Subjection and Unchristian Rebellion," takes up the challenge of the Romanist, "What one point of our religion is not Catholic?" and replies: "No one point of that which this reader hath refused is truly catholic." After specifying some of the novelties of popery, he says: "These,

with infinite other superstitions in action and errors in doctrine, we deny to have any foundation in the Scriptures or confirmation in the general consent or use of the Catholic Church." We recognize no doctrine as Catholic, but that which is contained in the Scriptures: "the faith once for all delivered to the saints." Papists would do well not to insist upon catholicity as a note of the Church, as by so doing they are in danger of unchurching their own communion.

§ 4. Antiquity.

So it is with regard to antiquity. Papists contend that theirs is the oldest Church, and that it is therefore the true Church. But is the Church of Rome the oldest Church? Were not the Churches of Jerusalem, Antioch, and several others founded before

the Church of Rome? But what has that to do with the question? The seven Apocalyptic Churches were founded by the apostles or apostolic men; but several of them became corrupt in faith and conduct, and their candlesticks have long since been removed out of their places. It is absurd for fallen Churches to set up the claim of antiquity. The question is, not what they once were, but what are they now?

Bellarmin says: "In every notable change in religion these six things can be discovered: (1) Its author; (2) some new doctrine; (3) the time in which it began; (4) who opposed it; (5) the place; (6) who were the persons that promoted the change." We heard Bishop England deliver himself in a similar way in his polemical discussion in the Baltimore Cathedral. There is glaring sophistry in all this. Suppose we could not "discern" all these "six things," in the case of some of the "notable changes in religion" for which the papal Church more than any other is distinguished, would it follow from this that they were not changes, not novelties? Suppose, for instance, that printing were unknown and centuries were to elapse, and it was forgotten that Pope Pius IX. decreed the immaculate conception of the Virgin in 1854 and the infallibility of the Pope in 1870 as dogmas, which before were only opinions, would that prove that they had been dogmas from the beginning of Christianity? Pope Pius IV. in 1564 added twelve articles to the Apostles' Creed. These articles had been introduced at various times

and by various men and methods, but they were crystallized into a symbolical form by that innovation. Are we to profess that this is the true Catholic faith, out of which there is no salvation, because we may not be able to tell when every one of these additions to the Apostles' Creed was first broached, who promoted and who opposed it? Is it not enough if we can show that not one of these twelve articles is contained in the Scriptures? Church history does indeed show the genesis of all these articles, how they were evolved from small germs of error, how they were opposed, how they made their way in the Romish, and some of them in other communions, and that not one of them can lay any claim to antiquity, if by antiquity is meant the time when the canon of the New Testament was made. When the question was asked a Protestant, "Where was your religion before Luther?" the answer was, "In the Bible, where yours never was!" Any particular Church,

built to-day "on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ being the chief corner-stone," is as true a part of the holy Catholic Church as the mother Church of Jerusalem, even if she had retained (which she has not) her virgin purity.

§ 5. Duration.

So of duration. Bellarmin says: "The Church is called catholic, because it always was and always will be, according to Dan. ii. 44, 'My kingdom shall stand forever.'"

Well, what of that? All admit that the Catholic Church will last till the end of time. "Upon this rock will I build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it," that is, it shall never become extinct. But it does not follow from this that particular Churches may not become corrupt and perish. Where now are the Churches of Ephesus, Laodicea, and others, mentioned with high honor in the New Testament? They lost their first love, became corrupt, and perished.

But says Bellarmin:

> Before the time of Luther there were in the world only these religions: Paganism, Judaism, Mohammedanism, the religion of the Greeks, Nestorianism, the heresy of the Hussites, and the Roman Church. But it is certain that the true Church of Christ was found in none of these; therefore

it was in the Roman Church; otherwise true religion perished from the earth, which cannot be.

This is pure fallacy. If by the true Church he means an organization untainted by error, then everybody knows that no such organization can be traced in history, and therefore "true religion *has* perished from the earth." If there be no true religion except in a Church untainted with error, there is no true religion now upon earth. Indeed, there never has been any.

In the days of the apostles, and in the best Churches which they founded, there were errors in doctrine and obliquities in worship and morals. The Acts and the Epistles record them.

But these organizations were Churches—true branches of the one Catholic Church—as are the various organizations now extant, including the most corrupt of them; the Roman and the Greek communions.

We need not refer to the Waldenses, that "ancient stock of religion"—as Milton calls the communion—which was in existence before the Roman apostasy, and needed not the reformation in the time of Luther; nor to the Culdees; nor to any other communions, which continued separate from the Roman Church.

232

In the darkest times God had a people on the earth; they were members of his invisible Church, and of his visible Church, too, for in all the different Christian communities specified by Bellarmin, and others which he does not name, were the Holy Scriptures still read and preached; the sacraments were administered; all the essential points of Christian doctrine, worship, and morals—as set forth in the Apostles' Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments—were held; though in many instances, and more especially in the Roman Church, with many errors, superstitions, and immoralities. The stream of Christianity has flowed down with an uninterrupted current through all the ages, though sometimes sadly discolored by foreign affluents, disported by winds, divided by impediments, absorbed by deserts, and concealed by jungles; but it has flowed on, is flowing, and will continue to flow to the end of time.

§ 6. Amplitude.

Amplitude is another of Bellarmin's notes, which he says points exclusively to the Church of Rome.

Here is another sophism. Amplitude is indeed a note of the Church, but more in prophecy than in history. What is amplitude but catholicity with another name? We have seen that, according to its constitution and destiny, the Church will embrace the whole world. But it has never done so yet, though the gospel was preached throughout the known world in the days of the apostles. (Col. i. 6.) But when was actual amplitude or catholic extension a note of the Church? Was it in the days of Noah (Gen. vi.–ix.)? in the time of the Psalmist (Ps. xvi.)? in the time of Elijah (1 Kings xix. 9–18)? in the time of Malachi (Mal. iii.)? in the time of Christ, when his followers were a "little flock" (Luke xii. 32)? in the times of the fathers,—*Athanasius contra mundum*? in the dark ages, when Mohammedanism almost "destroyed God's Asian fold" and superstition deluged the Western Church? What kind of amplitude has the Roman Church at this day? It boasts of its millions of adherents, but the great bulk of them are no better than heathens or infidels. There are good men among them, but they are a sad minority. Indeed, as yet, all the nominal Christians in the world constitute but a small flock, compared with heathens, Mohammedans, and infidels, who comprise three-fourths of the inhabitants of the globe. But is this the test of truth?

§ 7. Episcopal Succession.

233

Episcopal succession is claimed by Bellarmin as another note of the Church. But this is claimed by all the Oriental and African Churches, and by the Anglican Church and its offshoots. It is thus defined by Dr. Hook, an eminent Anglican:

> A perfect and unbroken transmission of the original ministerial commission from the apostles to their successors, by the progression and perpetual conveyance of their powers from one race of bishops to another. . . . Such then is uninterrupted succession—a fact to which every bishop, priest, and deacon in the wide world looks as the ground of validity in his orders. Without this all distinction between a clergyman and a layman is utterly vain, for no security exists that Heaven will ratify the acts of an illegally constituted minister on earth. Without it ordination confers none

but humanly derived powers.

In this explicit and arrogant assumption all prelatical Churches (except the Lutheran) agree. But this must be modified by two remarkable facts: (1) Many of the foremost prelates and others in those communions utterly repudiate the arrogant dogma; (2) the Anglican Church recognizes the true episcopal character of all the Oriental, African, and Roman Communions, while none of them recognize the true episcopal character of the Anglican Church, or indeed of one another. But of this boasted prelatical succession—whether Oriental, Occidental, or Anglican—the Scripture says not a single word. We look in vain in the New Testament for the staple to which the chain is to be affixed, and for any precedent or precept for the fabrication of the links. Ecclesiastical history, alike by its obscurity, mendacity, and veracity, sets aside the dogma as a preposterous fable.

§ 8. Apostolical Agreement.

Apostolical agreement is another of Bellarmin's notes. This is, of course, a note of the Church. Apostolicity is one of the four notes specified in the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed. We are not, however, to infer that no particular society of Christians is a Church which does not in every particular agree with the doctrines taught by the apostles. If their writings are accepted in good faith, and there is the purpose to conform to them, it may be considered a Church, though erroneous in many particulars. But for this principle the Romish Communion could not be considered a Church, as it embodies more error in its Creed than, perhaps, any other communion that bears the Christian name. Pope Pius IV. added to the Creed twelve articles, not one

of which is found in the writings of the apostles. The late Pope Pius IX. added two more dogmas—the immaculate conception of the Virgin and the infallibility of the Pope. Where are they inculcated in the New Testament? Infallibility in vain. Was not Pope Zephyrinus a Montanist? Marcellinus an idolater? Liberius an Arian? Anastasius a Nestorian? Vigilius a Eutychian? Honorius a Monothelite? Sylvester a magian? John XX. held that the souls of the righteous will not see

God till the day of judgment; and John XXIII. taught that the soul dies with the body. Wonderful "apostolical agreement" is this.

§ 9. Unity.

Unity is very properly set down in the Constantinopolitan Creed as a note of the Church. There is but one Church of Christ, as there is but one Christ who is its Head, and one Spirit that informs it as the body of Christ. But the Scripture nowhere speaks of an external, organic, visible unity. The idea is absurd. There never was such a unity since the apostles and their coadjutors organized Churches apart from the mother Church of Jerusalem. It was perhaps intended that all the societies in a city and its suburbs should be under one presbyterial government, and it is perhaps to be wished that that *regime* could be restored. But the New Testament never speaks of the *Church* of a province, but of the *Churches*. They were all, indeed, under the joint superintendency of the apostles, who during their life were a bond of union to all the Christian societies in the world. But no provision was made, as none was needed, for any such authoritative, ecumenical government, whether of pope or council. It is enough that all Christians are united to Christ, "built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief cornerstone." (Eph. ii. 20.) The only unity that is attainable is "the unity of the Spirit in the bonds of peace." (Eph. iv.) Those who unchurch others who cannot pronounce their *Shibboleth*—because they follow not with them—are the last men to talk about unity: they ought to say nothing about this as a note of the Church; by their arrogance they unchurch themselves rather than those they seek to unchurch. We "call no man master, for one is our Master, even Christ, and all we are brethren." (Matt. xxiii. 8.) It is impossible for all men to think alike, in points of

doctrine, discipline, and worship; and the only rule that can be consistently adopted is that of the ancients: "In essentials, unity; in non-essentials, liberty; in all things, charity."

Prelatists tell us that the successional episcopacy is the bond of union. But Dr. Newman retorts: "Either there is no such sin as schism, or unity does not lie in the episcopal form, or in episcopal

ordination." A child can see that. What sort of visible organic unity is that of episcopal communions which not only decline intercommunion, but anathematize each other as fiercely as they anathematize non-episcopal communions? Möhler, in his work on the "Unity of the Church," shows by what logical steps he was led "to the doctrine of the Papacy, on the basis of visible organic union." Even Litton admits:

There is, of course, a sense in which the aggregate of visible Christian societies may be called one Church; they profess, as Pearson observes, the same faith, they celebrate the same sacraments, they acknowledge one Lord Jesus Christ; in this sense there is a visible Catholic Church. But it is obvious that a unity of this kind is nothing higher than that which subsists between the monarchical states of Europe, which agree in being founded on the same principles of government, but are otherwise distinct communities, acknowledging no common head upon earth. Similarly, there is a sense in which Christ may be called the Head of this visible Catholic Church. He is so, not immediately and by direct union, but on account of the inseparable connection between the visible and the true Church, the members of the latter being not to be looked for outside the pale of the former.

This verges on self-contradiction; in avoiding Scylla there is danger of running into Charybdis. Surely the unity of the visible Church is something higher than that which subsists between monarchical states; and the headship of Christ is not to be restricted to "individual members of visible Churches;" it surely extends to them in their corporate capacity. (*Cf.* Matt. xviii. 20; xxviii. 19, 20; 1 Cor. xii.; Rev. i.; ii.; iii.; Acts *passim*; and Eph. iv., which Litton does not satisfactorily explain.)

[Leaving the Scriptures, we find at once the tendency that has made the unity of the Church a prominent question. During the ante-Nicene and Patristic ages generally the foundations were laid of a doctrine of absolute uniformity. The growth of heresies and schisms was the first occasion of this very early idea of a mechanical unity—these two words becoming very soon fixed in their meaning as follows: *Heresy* is the self-willed choice of some particular error and consequent departure from the Christian Confession. Every Church which renounces the fundamental doctrines of Christianity is out of the unity of Christendom: not that it must necessarily be at once cut off; the tribunal is an invisible one; and the excision is from on high. As to the outward expression of unity, the violation is *Schism*: strife within the community itself, separation from it, whether by voluntary

act or as cast out. In the latter case there may be a justification which shall clear the apparent breach from sinfulness. But in the Patristic age there was

no thought of a justifiable schism. Three representative men may be cited as the leading exponents of these views and of the different ways in which they were maintained. Ignatius, an Apostolical Father of the first century, laid down the principle that the one episcopate was the only bond of union —meaning, however, only that in every Church the chief minister was the guarantee of order as against schism and of sound doctrine as against heresy. Irenaeus in the second century made the One Church, as the congregation of all Churches under this episcopal government, the only organ of the Holy Ghost: where we have a singular combination of visible and invisible unity. Cyprian of the third century (250), in his work *De Unitate*, pointed to Rome as the center of unity, though rejecting Roman jurisdiction—a position which was very generally assumed.

The further development of the principle that internal unity must be expressed by external uniformity belongs to Ecclesiastical History. By degrees the Roman bishop of bishops assumed to be to the whole Church what each bishop was to the individual Church. The ecclesiastical was conformed to the civil order, the Caesar of a temporal universal empire must have for his counterpart the spiritual Caesar, or the Vicar of Christ as the center of unity and final appeal. The spirit of protest against this began in the East, which resented both the *Filioque* added to the Nicene Creed and the authority by which it was added. The breach between Eastern and Western Christendom has never been healed: it remains as a standing protest against the erroneous doctrine of unity. While Rome denounces the Protestant communities as out of the pale of the one body of Christ, the Orthodox Greek Church denounces Rome as the first of all Protestant dissenters, heretics, and schismatics. In the West the Protestant Reformation utterly rejected the theory of an external unity as held by both communities, whether [Roman] Catholic or [Greek] Orthodox.

A few remarks may be made upon modern tendencies in the interpretation of the note of unity since the Reformation.

(1) It is generally conceded to be impracticable to aim at oneness in the visible Church save in the fundamentals of faith, worship, and discipline. It must be obvious to every dispassionate mind that there has never been since the times of the apostles any other unity than that which God alone can discern. Eastern and Western Christendom would agree that there has been none such since the seventh century; and each despairs of the restoration of union save on terms which the other cannot accept. Among Protestant communities only one judgment ought to prevail here. There are found, however, certain hierarchical or High-church enthusiasts who dream of a unity which a lineal apostolical succession of orders gives to Eastern and Western episcopal communions. But this is the most unreal of unrealties. A compromise is attempted by those who, whether Anglican with episcopacy, or Lutheran without it, give up the hope of a universal unity, but cling to that expressed by national Churches in every land. This

is the religious unity of race or nation or territory. But it can never be proved that the Head of the Church divided his kingdom, or intended that it should be divided, territorially. The Congregational theory which admits only of voluntary aggregation of Churches, and neither has nor desires any guarantee for more than that, goes to an extreme, but in the right direction.

237

(2) But this tends to the modern correction of the notions of Heresy and Schism. There are some important principles which are now generally accepted. These two violations of unity generally go together: the αἵρεσις or heresy being self-willed choice of private interpretation in opposition to Scripture, and the *σχίσμα* the following of a party. Few schisms can be named which have not been the result of doctrinal error; few leading heresies which have not issued in schisms. Here, however, there is a distinction. Heresy can never be perpetuated, but the result of schisms may. Ecclesiastical schisms may be taken up by Divine wisdom into the development of the kingdom of Christ—having been in fact not schism in the sight of God, or soon losing the taint. Apparent schism may be the only cure of heresy. Many minor heresies may co-exist with holding the Head. But where, on the one hand, there is such infidel subtraction from the faith, or, on the other, such superstitious addition to it, as neutralize the fundamentals, separation may be inevitable and lawful. Discipline may be so relaxed or perverted as to necessitate separations which are not schismatical: Dissent and Non-conformity are not necessarily and as such sinful. Schism maybe the sin of the community left as well as of the community leaving. But all this rises to the higher principle that the Holy Spirit is the Giver of life corporate as well as individual. He quickeneth whom He will. The body is more than its raiment: any such act of the sovereign Spirit must aim at the more effectual growth of the Church. He thus prevents unity from degenerating into stagnant uniformity. He calls them his people that were not a people, in order to provoke others to jealousy. Lastly, whenever the Spirit thus goes out of his way to divide existing churches, he never fails to authenticate his own acts: as Paul among the apostles was able to authenticate his vocation and work. As to heresy, or self-willed and needless schism, it is still one of the *works of the flesh*: condemned of itself.

(3) There are two opposite errors on the whole subject which, always observable, are very prominent in modern times. One is the overvaluation of the importance of unity, as uniformity. This is rebuked by reason. Scripture, and the evidence of the fact that the Holy Ghost does administer the work of Christ by sects and divisions. Much of the progress of the Gospel, and many of its most glorious achievements at home and abroad, may be traced to the labors of Christian societies to a great extent independent of each other. But undervaluation of it is equally wrong. Though variety is ordained of God, the nearer to uniformity, or at least to

thorough mutual recognition, the estate of Christendom can be made the better will it be for its peace and dignity and prosperity. In due time Christ, who at his first coming *made both one*, uniting Jews and Gentiles, will blend all communions into unity, and his Church shall by his presence be in all its multitude of branches made perfect in one.[1]]

§ 10. Sanctity of Doctrine.

Sanctity of doctrine is another of Bellarmin's notes. It is a good one. But, as a Jesuit, he ought to handle it warily. There are immoral and detestable doctrines charged upon the Jesuits. If the charge is true—and we have never seen it successfully refuted—this

note, if pressed, would prove fatal to their claims, not only that their Church is the only true Church, but that it is any part of the true Church of Christ, all of whose doctrines are according to godliness. Our Article well says: "The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in which the pure word of God is preached." All the doctrines of the Church are pure, like their Divine Author, and lead to nothing but purity of heart and life [never, directly or indirectly, inculcating immorality, or suggesting that the end sanctifies the means]. "Thy word is very pure: therefore thy servant loveth it." (Ps. cxix. 140.)

§ 11. Efficacy of Doctrine.

Efficacy of doctrine is another very good note. It is, in brief, the gospel, which is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth. A society calling itself Christian that does not so wield the truth as to convert men, "to open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God," ought not to be considered a Church of Christ. It may have a name to live, but it is dead. Look abroad upon Christendom and see the effects produced by the teaching of the respective communities which call themselves Churches, and it will be easy to see which of them are best entitled to this distinction.

§ 12. Holiness of Life.

Holiness of life is another of Bellarrain's notes. We do not object to it. The Church of Christ is a society of saints, less or more matured in holiness, less or more commingled with hypocrites and mere nominal professors; still it is mainly constituted of saints. The field is a wheat field, though an enemy may have sown tares among the wheat. But such examples of sanctitude as are found in Butler's "Lives of the Saints," and other hagiologies of the Romish and other corrupt Churches, are foreign from the subject. It is revolting to our common sense to read the descriptions (most of them fictitious) of their puerile performances, ascetic acts of self-denial, and self-torture worthy of Indian fakirs.

[This leads to the consideration of two currents of error which this Note of the Church detects: the exaggeration of the relative and of the absolute sanctity respectively.

1. As to the former, many circumstances have had the effect of limiting the

sanctity of the body to its outward fellowship. The notion of an inherent virtue in the sacraments, especially when these sacraments were multiplied so as to hedge in all life, tended to externalize the idea of religion generally, and of the ordinances of Christian fellowship in particular. So also the early and unregulated alliance of Christianity with the State had the same effect, as the perversion of what was in itself not necessarily evil. Whether the developed Roman theory, that the Church is invested with the supreme authority over the world, or the Erastian, that it is only an organ of the State, or the Latitudinarian, that the Church and State are several aspects of the same thing, [be held] the evidence of fact, multiplied into endless instances, goes to prove that the union, as it has been generally seen in Christendom, has always had this evil issue. Neglect of discipline, one of the worst results of bringing into too close relations the world and the Church, has tended the same way. The Lord's *Take these things hence!* gave a law and established a precedent too soon forgotten. The illustrations of this are endless, but they carry us too deeply for our present purpose into ecclesiastical history.

2. The internal sanctity has sometimes been undervalued. Some schisms in the early Church—Montanism in Phrygia, Novatianism in Rome, Donatism in Africa—were the result of undue rigor in rooting out the tares; the extremest fanaticism was the consequence. In more recent times Puritanism, whether on the Continent or in England, has pushed its high principle too far. Hence Modern Congregationalism, its lineal descendant and representative in this country, counts no sanctity of the external Church as valid to establish a Christian character or availing for membership without the profession of conscious faith. The Baptists go

farther, and refuse to admit that the dedication of children to God in baptism confers on them any even external relation to the Church as holy. This, at least, is their principle when carried to its issues.

3. The true theory seems to be that which aims at the medium.

(1) All who approve themselves believers in Christ, and who, whether as adults or as children, are baptized, belong to the external body, and are entitled to all its privileges. Due respect to the outward and visible Church requires the recognition of all baptized and consistent members of it, without demanding personal testimony of conscious experience. But the internal sanctity of the fellowship has its rights. The Sacrament of the Lord's-supper, the seal of the communion of saints, and their note of profession among men, must be guarded with care, its approaches being fenced in every possible way suggested by pastoral vigilance and mutual watchfulness. In some manner communicants ought to be examined and approved one by one.

(2) The method of accomplishing this has varied with every age and almost with every community. By many of the later national Churches it has been too often entirely neglected: public warnings and confessions being only to a slight degree re-enforced by private investigation. The *class-meeting* among the Methodists is their method of meeting one of the greatest difficulties of the times. It does not profess to impose a new condition of membership in the Christian Church. It is only one out of many forms—certainly the most wide-spread and permanent—which the Ecclesiola in Ecclesia, or the society within the Church, has assumed. No religious community has long maintained its vigor and purity without some such expedient. This one in particular honors the Church's note of external

sanctity by admitting freely every anxious applicant on the sole condition that he as a baptized member of the Church of Christ is desirous to flee from the wrath to come and to find salvation in the name of Jesus. It brings everyone under pastoral supervision, direct or indirect: indirect, as the leaders of these classes are themselves part of the minister's flock; and direct, inasmuch as these little companies are under the discipline of a quarterly visitation . This institution provides the means of mutual social edification, in addition to the general means of grace, and thus does much to promote both the external and the internal sanctity of the community: the external, because it tends to give more reality and dignity to the outward fellowship of the Christian Church; the internal, because it brings all the members under the influence of an edifying mutual exhortation and prayer. Apart from its modern name, this form of fellowship may be traced almost [or quite] up to the times of the apostles.[2]]

§ 13. Miracles.

Bellarrain makes miracles another note of the Church. We make it also a note of the Church. We do not see how the Church could have been founded without miracles. Without arguing in a vicious circle we can prove the miracles by the Church, and the Church by the miracles. Nothing in history is better authenticated than the miracles wrought by Christ and his apostles. Their miracles attested their divine legation and the truth of the doctrines they preached, and established on a permanent basis the Church which they founded. We have no other use for miracles; hence no miracles have been wrought since the Church was founded by the apostles and their immediate successors. Scarcely any thing does more to discountenance the claims of the Romanists to be a true branch of the Church—not to say "the Catholic Church"—than the lying wonders which in every age of the world they have put forth for miracles. These "pious frauds" are without number. Romish literature teems with them. Their falsehood has been exposed a thousand times. No matter; the miserable lies are repeated, until even the priests almost believe their own falsehoods. It is scandalous, impious, damnable. Just to think of popes and prelates pretending to liquefy the blood of St. Januarius, to bring fire from heaven, to heal the sick by a word or touch, to change a wafer into the body, blood, soul, and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ! It demands the utmost charity to allow such a communion, sanctioning lies and frauds so prodigious, to have any part or lot in the matter of the Church of Christ. As it could not be conceived how two Roman augurs could meet and look one another in the

face without smiling at the frauds they were enacting, so may it be said of Roman prelates and priests who palm all this jugglery upon the besotted, hoodwinked people for miracles, stupendous acts wrought by the power of God.

§ 14. Prophecy.

Prophecy is another of Bellarmin's notes. But prophecy is a note of the Church only as miracles are a note. The Church was organized as predicted; the Spirit of prophecy was poured out upon the first believers; some of them uttered predictions which were put on record in the New Testament, for the authentication of the faith

and the excitation of the hope of the Church; and there the matter ends. The Spirit of prophecy was not needed after the apostolic age, and it was not imparted. It is absurd and impious for any one—Papist, Irvingite, Mormon, or any other—to claim the powder of foretelling future events. It is easy enough to put this to the test. There never has been pope, prelate, priest, or saint who could predict a single contingent event, any more than he could raise the dead. Let the infallible pope tell us how his temporal power, for instance, shall be restored, and then, if his vaticination come true, we may concede that the spirit of prophecy may be in the Vatican, if nowhere else.

§ 15. Admission of Adversaries.

Admission of adversaries is another of Bellarmin's notes. This is very ambiguous. Infidels generally admit that Protestants conform more nearly to the Scriptures than the Papists. Few of them would seek the true Church of Christ in the Romish communion. Thousands have renounced Christianity altogether because in Romish countries it is identified with the Romish Church.

Papists, indeed, try to make capital out of their own arrogance and exclusiveness. Because, forsooth, Protestants, in their liberality, are willing to admit that the Romish Communion may be a true Church, though corrupt, while the latter denies that Protestants are any part of the Catholic Church, therefore they are the temple of the Lord, and heathens all beside! A fine premium is this on arrogancy and pride. And yet this transparent sophistry beguiles thousands of simple souls.

§ 16. Unhappy End of Adversaries.

242

The unhappy end of adversaries is another of Bellarmin's notes. He borrowed this from the Fathers. We cannot depend upon their statements concerning the deaths of the ancient persecutors of the Church. Christ and his apostles never put this forward as a criterion of the truth. Christ suffered an ignominious and cruel death; so did most of the apostles; so did thousands of primitive Christians under

Pagan persecutions; so did thousands of the best men that ever lived under Papist persecutions. When Charles II. twitted Milton with his blindness as a judgment on him for taking part with regicides, he reminded the dissolute monarch that his royal father lost not his eyes merely, but his head. But it is useless to dwell on this note.

§ 17. Temporal Felicity.

The last note Bellarmin gives is temporal felicity. How this agrees with the Beatitudes and the repeated assurances of Christ and the apostles that in the world his followers were to have tribulation and suffer the loss of all things, we cannot very well see. There are, indeed, glowing predictions of peace and prosparity, spiritual and temporal, in the latter-day glory of the Church, commonly called the Millennium; but how does the temporal felicity of that future time point out to us the true Church when it is pressing up through great tribulation, as it has been during the greater part of its history?

If the reference be to the bearing of the Church upon the temporal welfare of those who come under its influence, why then, of course, it must be pronounced most beneficial. But compare the influence exerted by the Church in Papist countries and that exerted by it in Protestant countries, and any one can see at a glance that upon this basis the latter has far more reason to consider itself the true Church than the former. It is proper to state that Tournely, Bailly, and other modern Romanists repudiate this note, “temporal prosperity,” and also that of the “unhappy end of adversaries,” as well they may.

§ 18. Conclusion.

We may well be content with the notes or characteristics of the Church, as set forth in this article. The Church is a congregation of faithful men—that is, a universal society of Christians which is visible, because it has its particular organizations and

assemblies. In this society the pure word of God is preached—that is, the truths contained in the Bible are proclaimed by men set apart

for this work, whose duty it is to expound and enforce the truths thus proclaimed: there maybe—there will certainly be—less or more error mixed in their teaching; but this will not prove that they do not belong to the Church, while the fundamental doctrines of the gospel are inculcated by them. In this society, too, the sacraments are duly administered, according to Christ's ordinance. There may be errors of defect or excess in the administration of the sacraments, but if all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same are retained we may not deny a place in the Church to those who thus administer them, or to those who receive the sacraments thus administered.

Thus if water be applied to a proper subject to initiate him into the Church, and to bring him under covenant obligations, and secure to him covenant blessings, we may consider it the sacrament of baptism; though there may be some variation or imperfection or superstition in the form and mode. So if bread and wine be reverently eaten and drunk in remembrance of the death of Christ, we may consider it the sacrament of the Lord's-supper, though there be superstitious additions to this simple and solemn rite.

There is one difficulty involved in the premises. During the Dark Ages the Romish Church gradually withdrew the cup in this sacrament from the laity, and the Councils of Constance and Trent in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries denied it to them by a positive law, enforced by the usual synodal curses. Whether this "half-communion," as it is called, can be considered a sacrament is a question. Wine is present and consecrated and drunk by the officiating minister, though not by the people. The ordinance, though thus mutilated, is celebrated to show forth the death of Christ; but can it be said it has "all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same?" Christians are to drink the cup, as well as to eat the bread, "according to Christ's ordinance" and the custom of the apostles and primitive Church, as the Councils of Constance and Trent explicitly admit.

The question is very perplexing. Glad indeed are we that we have not to establish our claim to a part in the visible Church with such a weight resting upon us. We do not recognize those

societies that repudiate the sacraments as Christian *Churches*, though we do not exclude their members from salvation. So we do not hold fellowship with Aquarians, who substitute water for wine

in this ordinance. Yet we do recognize the Romish Communion as a part of the visible Church, notwithstanding this serious defect, to say nothing of the superstitions connected with their mass, as they call this sacrament. We confess that charity is consulted more than logic, or perhaps consistency, in reaching this conclusion.

---

1. “Compendium,” etc , Vol. III., pp. 272–275.↩
2. Pope, “Compendium,” etc.. Vol. III., pp. 277–279.↩

Part II.

Article XIV.
Of Purgatory.

245

The Romish doctrine concerning purgatory, pardons, worshiping and adoration, as well of images as of relics, and also invocation of saints, is a fond thing, vainly invented, and grounded upon no warrant of Scripture, but repugnant to the word of God.

Introduction.

This is the same as Article XXII. of the Anglican Confession, save that the word “rather,” before repugnant, is omitted. The Twenty-third Article of the Confession in King Edward’s reign had “the doctrine of the school-authors,” as it had not then crystallized so fully into a Romish doctrine as afterward. The Edwardine article also had “perniciously repugnant.”

The title of the article seems to give prominence to purgatory; but the compilers were not very precise in matters of this sort. It is enough that purgatory comes first in order.

Chapter I.
The Romish Doctrine of Purgatory.

§ 1. The Doctrine as Defined by Councils and Theologians.

246

The Romish doctrine concerning purgatory is thus set forth by the Council of Florence:

That if true penitents depart in the love of God, before they have satisfied for their sins of omission or commission by fruits of repentance, their souls go to purgatory to be purged.

The Council of Trent, in its twenty-fifth session, says:

Since the Catholic Church, instructed by the Holy Spirit from the sacred writings and the ancient tradition of the Fathers, hath taught in holy councils, and lastly in this ecumenical synod, that there is a purgatory; and that the souls detained there are assisted by the suffrages of the faithful, but especially by the acceptable sacrifice of the altar; this holy synod commands all bishops diligently to endeavor that the wholesome doctrine concerning purgatory delivered to us by venerable Fathers and sacred councils be believed, held, taught, and everywhere preached by Christ's faithful.

In the sixth session the thirteenth canon reads as follows:

If any one shall say that after the reception of the grace of justification the guilt is so remitted to the penitent sinner, and the penalty of eternal punishment destroyed, that no penalty of temporal punishment remains to be paid, either in this world or in the future in purgatory, before the access to the kingdom of heaven can be open; let him be accursed.

The Catechism of the Council of Trent says:

In the fire of purgatory the souls of just men are cleansed by a temporary punishment, in order to be admitted into their eternal country, into which nothing defiled entereth.

The Douay Catechism contains the following:

Q. Whither go such as die in venial sin, or not having fully satisfied for the punishment due to their mortal sins? *A.* To purgatory, till they have made full satisfaction for them, and then to heaven.

Purgatory is, with the Romanists, a place as well as a state.

They have five receptacles for departed spirits: heaven, *limbus patrum*, *limbus infantum*, purgatory, and hell.

Dens, a high authority among Romanists, has the following:

Q. Where is purgatory? *A.* The ordinary place of purgatory, which properly and commonly is understood by that name, is under the earth, and adjoining to

hell. But St. Thomas Aquinas thinks that souls are, in extraordinary cases, purged out of this place. "Some," he says, "are punished in different places, either for the instruction of the living or the benefit of the dead, that their punishment being known to the living may be mitigated by the suffrages of the Church." And thus Pope Gregory (lib. iv. of his "Dialogue," c. 40) produces an example of the soul of Paschasius, which was purged in the baths.

Dens says the punishment is twofold: what they lose, and what they feel, the latter being by fire, by which the Romish divines generally understand natural fire. Aquinas says it exceeds any punishment in this life. Bonaventure and Bellarmin say that the greatest punishment in purgatory exceeds any in this life, though the least punishment there is not greater than the greatest on earth. Its duration is indefinite; it maybe shortened by masses, etc.

Wesley copied into his journal, August 30, 1738, the following notice posted on the door of a cathedral:

A Full Release for the Poor Souls in Purgatory.

His Papal Holiness, Clement XII. hath this year 1738, on the 7th of August, most graciously privileged the Cathedral Church of St. Christopher in Mentz; so that every priest, as well secular as regular, who will read mass at an altar for the soul of a Christian departed, on any holy day, or any day within the octave thereof, or on two extraordinary days, to be appointed by the ordinary, of any week in the year, may each time deliver a soul out of the fire of purgatory.

Roman Catholic works abound with such cases, and reports of souls tormented in the fires of purgatory, crying out for deliverance, and through the suffrages of their friends on earth stepping out of purgatory into heaven. Purgatorial societies are formed, the members of which pay certain sums statedly to pay for masses to be said for the deliverance of the poor souls suffering in purgatory. It is not to be supposed that all Papists believe these lying stories, though certified by popes, prelates, and priests. But every Papist is bound to believe there is a purgatory, and that the souls in

purgatory are relieved by their friends on earth, as it is thus set forth in the Creed of Pope Pius IV.: “I constantly hold that there is a purgatory, and that the souls detained therein are helped by the suffrages of the faithful.”

§ 2. Alleged Scriptural Proofs.

Romanists attempt to prove their doctrine of purgatory by Scripture, the Fathers, Councils, miracles, and reason.

The proofs which they adduce from Scripture are the following:

248

Isa. xxii. 14: “Surely this iniquity shall not be purged from you till ye die.” They say this implies that it would be purged from them after death. It does no such thing; but if it did, it would not prove that there was a purgatory. The text merely asserts that the profligates spoken of by the prophet were so incorrigibly bad that their case was hopeless. They were living in mortal sin and would die in it, and Papists themselves say there is no purgatory, and no pardon after death for such sinners. A thousand texts of this sort would prove nothing to the purpose.

2 Macc. xii. 44, 45: “For if he had not hoped that they that were slain should have risen again, it had been superfluous and vain to pray for the dead. And also in that he perceived that there was great favor laid up for them that died godly. It was a holy and good thought; whereupon he made a reconciliation for the dead, that they might be delivered from sin.” How often do Romish priests cite this passage on formal occasions—All-souls-day, etc.! But this is no Scripture. It is found in one of the most worthless books of the Apocrypha, and is utterly unworthy of notice. But confused and uncanonical as is this account, it does not prove a purgatory. It says nothing about purgatory. According to this record, some of the Jews who fell in battle were found to have concealed about them “things consecrated to the idols of the Jamnites,” this being “the cause wherefore they were slain:” whereupon Judas made a collection of two thousand drachms of silver, to send to Jerusalem to offer a sin-offering, “doing therein very well and honestly,” says the writer, “in that he was mindful of the resurrection.” Here is not a word about purgatory. He made an offering and offered prayer for these sinners that they might be

delivered from sin, and have part in the resurrection of the just. He had no authority and no Scripture precedent for this; and it affords no authority or precedent for purgatory and prayers for the dead, as taught by Rome; for these idolaters died in mortal sin, and those who die in mortal sin do not go to purgatory, but to hell. They must be hard run to cite this passage as a proof-text for purgatory.

Matt. v. 25, 26: "Agree with thine adversary quickly, while thou art in the way with him; lest at any time the adversary deliver thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and thou be cast into prison. Verily I say unto thee, thou shalt by no means come out thence, till thou hast paid the uttermost

farthing." It is remarkable that this text is not only cited by Romanists for their purgatory, but also by Universalists for their hell-redemption, and by some of the orthodox for eternal punishment. But as Davidson says: "When the parable in Luke (xii. 58, 59) is compared we see that it has no reference to the future state, but to a suit in a court of justice." The language is proverbial. A litigious spirit is not only contrary to the genius of Christianity, but it involves its possessor in many evils which may be averted by the exercise of a pacific, yielding temper. Better sacrifice some of our rights than by an overstiffness exasperate the feeling of an adversary. (*Cf.* verses 38–42.)

Matt. xii. 32: "Whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come." From this Romanists infer that some sins will be forgiven in purgatory. But "the world to come" does not mean purgatory. If it does not mean the Christian dispensation as contrasted with the Jewish, it simply means the future state. The language is a strong periphrasis, meaning it shall never be forgiven: Mark and Luke, writing for Gentiles, use plain language instead of the Hebrew idiom, "Hath never forgiveness, but is in danger of eternal damnation;" "it shall not be forgiven." According to the Romish theory sins are *punished* in purgatory, not *pardoned!*

1 Cor. iii. 13–15: "Every man's work shall be made manifest; for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire; and the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is. If any man's work abide which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward. If any man's work shall be burnt, he shall suffer loss; but he himself shall be saved; yet so as by fire." Here too the Universalists

find hell-redemption where Papists find the fire of purgatory and deliverance from it. But Peter de Soto, a famous Romanist, sees no purgatory here. He says: “It is not persons, but vain doctrines, called wood, hay, stubble, which some well-meaning but mistaken teachers add to the true that shall, on the day of judgment, be tried by fire and be burned, and themselves shall hardly escape, even as one escapeth out of the fire.” The reference, however, may be to persons. The apostle warns ministers not to introduce unworthy persons into the Church, as such would not stand the test of persecution, the fire which would try every man’s work. Though “well-meaning

but mistaken teachers” might save themselves, as those who escape through fire, yet it would be mortifying to them to see their work destroyed. Good Christians compared to incombustible materials, as gold, silver, solid stones, would stand the fire; others, compared to wood, hay, stubble, would not. The metaphor is popular, and not to be pressed.

1 Pet. iii. 18–20: “For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit; by which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison; which sometime were disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water.” This text has been pressed into the service of the Universalists—the prison being hell. It certainly cannot mean purgatory; because those antediluvian sinners died in mortal sin, and such go to hell, not to purgatory, according to Rome. But the right meaning of the text is that given to it by Bede:

> He who, in our times, coming in the flesh, preached the way of life to the world, even he himself came before the flood and preached to them who were then unbelievers and lived carnally. For even he, by his Holy Spirit, was in Noah, and in the rest of the holy men which were at that time, and by their good conversation preached to the wicked men of that age, that they might be converted to better manners.

It is hardly necessary to remark (though the mistake of some might make it expedient to note) that “he went and preached,” or “having gone he preached,” is simply a pleonasm for “he preached.” So the Syriac. (*Cf.* Eph. ii. 17.) He preached by the Spirit in Noah. (Gen. vi. 3; 2 Pet. ii. 5.) Those to whom he preached by Noah were

those in the flesh, though they were disembodied spirits in prison—in hell—when Peter wrote, where they are still. The Fathers had a conceit that Christ went after death and delivered the souls of the pious ancients from the *limbus patrum*, but this wild notion has no affinity to purgatory.

§ 3. Patristic Proofs.

As the Scriptures give the Romanists no support for purgatory, they fall back upon the Fathers. But what if the Fathers did believe it? All the worse for the Fathers. However, though they had errors enough, this does not appear to be one of them.

Burnet says:

> It were easy to show that the doctrine of purgatory, as it is now in the Roman Church, was not known in the Church of God for the first six hundred years; that then it began to be doubtfully received. But in an ignorant age, visions, legends, and bold stories prevailed much; yet the Greek Church never received it. Some of the Fathers speak, indeed, of the last probatory fire; but though they did not think the saints were in a state of consummate blessedness, enjoying the vision of God, yet they thought they were in a state of ease and quiet, and that in heaven.

Augustin prayed for his mother Monica, though he believed that she was in heaven. The Fathers prayed for all the righteous dead, including the Virgin Mary, though they considered them all in heaven. Aerius asked what was the use of praying for them. The only answer they gave was that while the saints were in the intermediate state, though in heaven, they might progress in holiness and happiness and have an early resurrection; and so they would help them, in these respects, by their prayers. But what has all this to do with purgatory? Nothing, except to show that the Fathers knew nothing of that *terra incognita*.

§ 4. The Action of Councils.

The Romanists plead the authority of Councils for this dogma. But what Councils? Not a single ecumenical Council received it. In 1439 Pope Eugenius contrived to get together a few prelates at

Florence, who prepared decrees affirming that the Pope is primate and head of the Church; that the Holy Spirit proceedeth from the Father and the Son; and that there is a purgatory! These decrees were signed by sixty-two Latin and eighteen Eastern Bishops—hardly a General Council. When the Greek prelates returned to Constantinople they were received with indignation, and the decrees utterly repudiated. The patriarchs of Antioch, Alexandria, and Jerusalem united in the protest against them. Thus it remains to the present day. The authority of the Council of Trent is recognized by none but the adherents of Rome.

§ 5. Miraculous Proofs.

Many leading Romanists appeal to miracles in support of this dogma. Ever since the days of Pope Gregory the Great, miraculous visions, apparitions, revelations, etc., have been repeated, and are generally believed, by the faithful, in regard to purgatory. Aetna and Vesuvius have been had in requisition for this purpose. Departed spirits were seen broiling on gridirons, roasting on spits, burning in the fire, smoking in chimneys.

252

Roads to purgatory were discovered in Sicily, Pozzuoli, and Ireland; pointed out by an angel or—devil. Gregory affected to believe these lies. In the tenth century Mosheim says the clergy, finding this superstition profitable, by pathetic discourses, monstrous fables, and fictitious miracles, labored to establish the doctrine of purgatory. Even St. Bernard speaks of a vision, in which a woman was gradually cleansed in purgatory. Bellarmin alludes to many other visions. A certain monk saw souls roasted on spits like pigs, devils drenching them with boiling lard. Bishop Theobald heard a miserable spirit under the ice, telling how he was tormented, and how he might be delivered, if for thirty continued days the Bishop would say for him thirty masses. Romish waitings are full of such wretched stuff. To this day it has a powerful effect upon the superstitious devotees of Rome. Millions of money have been given to priests to say masses for souls in purgatory. It would be vain to attempt any serious refutation of these pious frauds, of which the better class of Romanists are ashamed.

§ 6. Rational Proofs.

The most plausible method of defending this doctrine, is that now adopted especially in Protestant countries. Romish polemics say, None but the perfectly pure can enter heaven; but few are thus perfectly pure at death; therefore they must be purged in the intermediate state, and that is purgatory. The Scripture assures us that God will render to every one according to his works. Now this would not be true if there were no such place as purgatory; for how would God render to everyone according to his works, if such as die in the guilt of any, even the least sin, which they have not taken care to blot out by repentance, would nevertheless go straight to heaven? To this some add that the souls in purgatory see the happiness of the saints in heaven, and are consumed, as it were, with longing desires to be with them, and that is the fire of purgatory.

It is impossible for any who have correct ideas of justification by faith and of the glorious doctrine that the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth from all sin, to be embarrassed by any such dilemmas as these. Nothing that we can do can atone for a single sin; the blood of Christ alone can do that, as the Scriptures assure us. “The chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed.” The reward, as well as

the punishment of the other world, will be dealt out according to every man’s character; but that does not affect the doctrine that we are saved alone by the merits of Christ, appropriated by a living faith. There will be progression in holiness and happiness in the other world; but that is not restricted to the intermediate state: it is quite possible that our progress will be more rapid when we shall “have our perfect consummation and bliss, both in body and soul in God’s eternal and everlasting glory.”

§ 7. Conclusion.

As the onus of proof is on the assertors of the dogma of purgatory, and they have utterly failed to prove it, we do not feel called on to prove the negative. It is enough to say that the

Scriptures divide the human family into two classes—the good and the bad—with almost infinite varieties in each division, and that they assign them, at death, to two places respectively—heaven and hell—the incorrigibly wicked going at once to the latter, and the good to the former—where each shall receive the things done in the body, according to that they have done, whether they be good or bad, the retribution beginning at death, and being consummated after the day of judgment. (Eccl. xii. 7, 13, 14; Luke xvi. 19–31; xxiii. 42–43; John v. 28, 29; Acts i. 25; 2 Cor. v. 1–10; Phil. i. 21–24; Rev. xiv. 13.)

Chapter II.
The Doctrine of Pardons or Indulgences.

254

The next thing noticed in the Article is the Romish doctrine of "pardons," which, like that of purgatory, is pronounced "a fond," that is, a foolish "thing, vainly invented and grounded upon no warrant of Scripture, but repugnant to the word of God." The Latin recension has *de indulgentiis*. The Romish doctrine of indulgences grew out of the doctrine of purgatory, and falls with it.

§ 1. Definition and History.

In the Nicene Church Bishops were allowed to mitigate the penance of offenders and restore them to the communion of the faithful, upon their repentance and good conduct. Subsequently alms-giving was substituted for penance. This custom is said to have originated in the seventh century with Theodore, Archbishop of Canterbury; but this is not stated in Godwin's life of that prelate. But those patristic pardons were different from Romish indulgences, which are exemptions from the temporal punishment of sin, in which they comprehend Church censures and the pains of purgatory. An indulgence is thus defined by Peter Dens:

> It is the remission of the temporal punishment due to sins, remitted as to their guilt, by the power of the keys, without the sacrament, by the application of the satisfactions which are contained in the treasury of the Church. This is the collection of the spiritual goods remaining: in the divine possession, the distribution of which is intrusted to the Church. In the first place it is collected from the superabundant satisfactions of Christ, next from the superfluous satisfactions of the blessed Virgin Mary and of the other saints. This treasury is the foundation or matter of indulgences, and is that infinite treasury made up in part from the satisfactions of Christ, so as never to be exhausted; and it daily receives the superabundant satisfactions of pious men.

Dens says that indulgences are divided into local, real, and personal; into plenary, non-plenary, more plenary, and most plenary; and into perpetual and temporal. The Pope has the power

of granting plenary indulgences to all Christians; but a Bishop only in his own diocese—the Pope by divine right, the

bishop by ecclesiastical right. Aquinas says the power is one of jurisdiction, not of order. Dens says the receiver must have been baptized, must have the use of reason, be in a state of grace, say certain prayers, visit churches, receive the eucharist, fast, give alms, confess, etc. He continues: "According to the same common and true opinion, it is sufficient that the last act of what is required be done in a state of grace, unless it is otherwise expressed in the diploma." Pope Leo X. says:

> The Roman Pontiff may, for reasonable causes, by his apostolical authority, grant indulgences out of the superabundant merits of Christ and the saints, to the faithful who are united to Christ by charity, as well for the living as for the dead, and that in thus dispensing the treasure of the merits of Jesus Christ and the saints, he either confers the indulgence by the method of absolution, or transfers it by the method of suffrage. Wherefore all persons, whether living or dead, who really obtain any indulgences of this kind, are delivered from so much temporal punishment, due according to divine justice for their actual sins, as is equivalent to the value of the indulgence bestowed and received.

The Council of Trent teaches:

> Since the power of conferring indulgences has been bestowed by Christ upon his Church, and this power divinely given has been used from the earliest antiquity, the holy council teaches and enjoins that the use of indulgences, so salutary to Christian people, and approved by the authority of venerable councils, shall be retained in the Church; and it anathematizes those who assert that they are useless, or deny that the Church has the power of granting them.

Pope Pius IV. has embodied it in his Creed, which contains the faith of Romanists: "I also affirm that the power of indulgences was left by Christ to the Church, and that the use of them is most wholesome to Christian people." How "wholesome" they have been history informs us. To excite the zeal of Europe at the time of the Crusades, to induce the superstitious fanatics to go forth against the infidels who had possession of Palestine, indulgences were proclaimed; and these were eagerly bought, because they wiped out the record of all past transgressions. It was under Pope Leo X. that this system attained its highest influence. The habits of that Pope were voluptuous and expensive; his treasury was exhausted, and he

sought to replenish it, to enable him to build the church of St. Peter, at Rome. The signing by him of the bull which authorized the sale of indulgences may be regarded as the great crisis of the Reformation in Europe. The tax to be collected was farmed out by the prelates in their several districts. They employed eloquent preachers to magnify the value of the indulgences, and, according

to the Pope's bull, all, "whether living or dead, were freed from so much temporal punishment, due according to divine justice for their actual sins, as is equivalent to the value of the indulgence bestowed and received."

D'Aubigné says:

A great agitation prevailed at this time among the German people. The Church had opened a vast market on earth. From the crowds of purchasers, and the shouts and jokes of the sellers, it might have been called a fair, conducted by monks. The merchandise which they were extolling, and which they offered at a reduced price, was, said they, the salvation of souls. These dealers traversed the country in a handsome carriage, accompanied by three horsemen, living in great state, and spending freely. When the procession approached a town, a deputy waited on the magistrate, and said, "The grace of God and of the Holy Father is at your gates!" Instantly every thing was in motion in the place. The clergy, the priests and nuns, the councils, the school-masters and their pupils, the trades with their banners, men and women, went out to meet those merchants, bearing lighted tapers in their hands, and advancing to the sound of music and all the bells: so that, says our historian, they could not have received God himself with greater honor! Salutations being exchanged, the procession moved toward the church. The pontiff's bull of grace was carried in front on a velvet cushion or on cloth of gold. The chief of the indulgence merchants came next, holding a large red wooden cross in his hand. As the procession thus moved along, amidst ringing, prayers, and the smoke of incense, the sound of the organ and loud music welcomed the merchant monk and his attendants into the temple. The cross which he carried was placed in front of the altar: on it were suspended the arms of the Pope; and, so long as it remained there, the clergy of the place and others came daily after vespers and, before the salutation, to render it homage. One person in particular attracted public attention on these occasions: it was he who carried the red cross and played the chief part. He was robed in the Dominican dress and moved with an air of arrogance. His voice was sonorous and seemed in its full strength, though he had already attained his sixty-third year. This was the celebrated, or rather the infamous, Tetzel. When the cross had been erected, he went into the pulpit, and in the presence of the crowd began to extol the value of indulgences:[1]

"Indulgences are the most precious and most noble of God's gifts. This cross (pointing to the red cross) has as much efficacy as the very cross of Jesus Christ. Come, and I will give you letters, all properly sealed, by which even the sins which you intend to commit may be pardoned. I would not change my privileges with those of St. Peter in heaven, for I have saved more souls by my indulgences than the apostle by his sermons. There is no sin so great that an indulgence cannot remit. Reflect, then, that for every mortal sin you must, after confession and contrition, do penance for seven years, either in this life or in purgatory. Now, how many mortal sins are there not committed in a day? How many in a month, week, year, and whole life? Alas! these sins are almost infinite, and they entail an infinite penalty in the fires of purgatory; and now, by

means of these letters of indulgences, you can once in your life, in every case except four, which are reserved for the apostolic see, and afterward in the article of death, obtain a plenary remission of all your penalties and all your sins; but more than this, indulgences avail not only for the living, but for the dead; for that repentance is not even necessary. Priest, noble, merchant, wife, youth, maiden, do you not hear your parents and other friends, who are dead, and who cry from the bottom of the abyss, 'We are suffering horrible torments; a trifling alms would deliver us! you can give it, and will not.' At the very instant that the money rattles at the bottom of the chest, the soul escapes from purgatory, and it flies liberated to heaven. O stupid and brutish people! who do not understand the grace so richly offered. Now heaven is everywhere opened, do you refuse to enter in? When, then, will you enter? Now you can ransom many souls. Stiff-necked and thoughtless man! with twelve groats you can deliver your father from purgatory, and you are ungrateful enough not to save him. I shall be justified in the day of judgment; but you—you will be punished so much the more severely for having neglected so great salvation. Do you know why our most holy Lord distributes so rich a grace? It is to restore the ruined Church of St. Peter and St. Paul, so that it may not have its equal in the world. Blessed are your eyes, for they see; and blessed are your ears, for they hear," etc.

Tetzel's absolution ran as follows:

May our Lord Jesus Christ have pity on thee, and absolve thee by the merits of his most holy passion; and I, by virtue of the apostolic power which has been confided to me, absolve thee from all ecclesiastical censures, judgments, and penalties which thou mayest have incurred; moreover, from all excesses, sins, and crimes that thou mayest have committed, however great and enormous they may be, and from whatever cause, were they even reserved for our most Holy Father, the pope, and for the apostolic see. I blot out all the stains of inability and all marks of

infamy that thou mayest have drawn on thyself on this occasion. I remit the penalties thou shouldst have endured in purgatory. I restore thee anew to the participation of the sacraments of the Church. I incorporate thee afresh in the communion of saints, and re-establish thee in the purity and innocence thou hadst at thy baptism, so that, in the hour of death, the gate by which sinners enter the place of torment shall be closed against thee, and the gate leading to the paradise of joy shall be open; and if thou shouldst not die for long years, this peace will remain unalterable till the last hour shall arrive. In the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Amen.

We know it is said that Tetzel abused the power which Leo had given him; but the great question is this: *Has Rome repented of her wickedness by giving up the system of indulgences?* No. The Council of Trent sanctioned them, even after the time that Luther had exposed them to all Europe, and they are continued to this day. We find (according to the system of jubilees established in the year 1300, under the pontificate of Boniface VIII.) that a bull was issued in 1825, offering to the faithful a liberal grant of indulgences. The vicar apostolic of the London

district issued, in the same year, “instructions and directions” for gaining this great boon. “Embrace, dearly beloved,” he said, “the benefit that is offered you by the indulgences of the present jubilee. Avail yourselves of every means of discharging your debt to the divine justice.”

On the 1st of December, 1850, a document was issued by “Nicholas by the divine mercy of the holy Roman Church, by the title of St. Pudentiana, Cardinal Priest, Archbishop of Westminster, and administrator apostolic of the diocese of Southwark,” proclaiming, by the authority of his “Holiness,” “an extraordinary jubilee.” “In order to encourage the faithful to partake of the benefits of this holy time, the Church liberally opens her precious treasures and grants to all a plenary indulgence in the form of a jubilee.”

A modern traveler tells us that in the city of Rome “you may buy as many masses as will free your soul from purgatory for twenty-nine thousand years at the Church of St. John Lateran on the festival of that saint; at Santa Bibiana, on All-souls-day, for seven thousand years.”[2]

Every year a lucrative system of indulgences is carried on in

Spain. Four bulls are sent annually from Rome; the profits are divided between the monarch and the Pope.

Even in Protestant countries indulgences are granted, though with more reserve and caution than in Popish countries. Indulgence tablets are frequently displayed in Churches, setting forth the conditions on which indulgences may be procured, and the term of their extension. We must refer to works on this subject for the details, which are too revolting to be here cited. See Elliott on Romanism, Book II., chap, xiii.; McClintock and Strong's "Cyclopedia," Art. Indulgences.

§ 2. Romish Proofs Considered.

It seems useless to enter upon any refutation of the dogma of indulgences; to state it is to refute it.

By referring to Matt. xvi. 19, "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven," etc.; John xxi. 17, "Feed my sheep," and the like passages of Scripture which have no reference whatever to the subject, Romanists acknowledge that the Bible affords no support to this detestable dogma.

259

Thomas Aquinas refers to the history of the adulterous woman (John viii.), the incestuous Corinthians (1 Cor. v.; 2 Cor. ii.)—sinners who were pardoned without making satisfaction. But every sinner is pardoned without making satisfaction—the only satisfaction for sins has been made by Jesus Christ, and is obtained alone by repentance and faith. But the richest argument is that advanced by Aquinas: "The Church general is infallible, and as it sanctions and practices indulgences, indulgences must be valid." How can any one answer such arguments? The Catholic Church is not infallible; it has greatly erred, and we adduce this dogma of indulgences as a proof of the assertion.

Indulgences are incompatible with the doctrine of justification by faith, the sanctification of the Spirit, a life of penitence and obedience, the promise of free and full pardon to all who truly repent and unfeignedly believe the gospel.

They impiously exalt the hierarchy, miserably delude the besotted people, encouraging them in their sins, and derogate from the merits of Christ and the grace of the Holy Spirit. They are "a

fond thing, vainly invented, and grounded upon no warrant of Scripture, but repugnant to the word of God:" like the works of supererogation noted in the Eleventh Article, already discussed.

---

1. "History of the Reformation," Book III., chap. 1.↩
2. "Rome in the Nineteenth Century," Vol. II., pp. 267–270.↩

Chapter III.
Image and Relic Worship.

§ 1. Introductory.

260

The next thing condemned in the Article is, “worshiping and adoration, as well of images, as of relics.” In the Latin recension as given by Bishop Browne, there is but one word, *veneratione*; but in the Latin version of Jo. Elis we find *de cultu et adoratione*. Burnett also has it adoration. Perhaps the word adoration was added to bring out more fully the idea that religious worship is intended. By images are comprehended all visible representations of any object, divine, angelic, or human; rational, irrational, or inanimate. By relics are meant any things supposed to have belonged to a saint, or to have been in any way connected with him—as the instrument by which a martyr was put to death. It is humiliating that there should be any necessity for a protest against idolatry and fetichism so debasing. But there is great need for it, as it is a marked characteristic of the Romish Church.

§ 2. Romish Statements.

The Council of Trent says:

Images of Christ, the Virgin Mother of God, and the saints, shall be retained in Churches and due honor and veneration given to them—not because any divinity or virtue is believed to be in them, for which they are to be worshiped, nor because any thing is to be sought from them, or faith reposed in them—as by the Gentiles, who placed their hope in images—but because the honor which is paid to them is referred to their prototypes, so that by means of the images, which we kiss and bow down before, we adore Christ and reverence the saints, whose likeness they bear.

The holy bodies of the martyrs and others living with Christ, whose bodies were living members of Christ and temples of the Holy Ghost, and will by him be raised to eternal life and glorified, are to be venerated by the faithful, since God bestows by them many benefits among men.

The Creed of Pope Pius IV. says:

The saints reigning together with Christ are to be honored and invocated that they offer prayers to God for us, and that their relics are to be venerated. I most firmly assert that the images of Christ and of the mother of God, ever Virgin, and

261

also of the other saints, are to be had and retained; and that due honor and veneration are to be given to them.

§ 3. Universality of the Practice.

The worship of images and relics is universal in the Church of Rome. Their chapels abound with these objects of idolatry, and they are adored with as much fervor as the heathens manifest in their idol-worship. Mr. Seymour says in his "Lectures:"

In the church of the Augustinians, at Rome, there is an image of the Virgin Mary. It is one called a miraculous image, that is, it works miracles. Our Lord cleansed the leper, healed the sick, cured the blind, and raised the dead. Lest this should steal away the hearts of the people from Mary to Christ, they have got up similar miracles as wrought by Mary, and, accordingly, every year this image of Mary works miracles of the same kind. It is as large as life, very coarse, and very ugly. It is dressed in silks and satins; the hands are covered with rings, the wrists with bracelets, the arms with armlets, the neck with half a dozen of necklaces—all being topaz and amethyst and rubies and diamonds. Her stomacher is black velvet, loaded with diamonds, and on her head is a diadem of diamonds that would grace an empress. All these were the offerings of her votaries. I reckoned no less than one hundred and sixty-seven rings, over and besides those on her fingers, arranged for display on her shrine. I have frequently visited this church; and as the high altar, where the priest says mass for the worship of Christ, is at one end, as the image of Mary is at the other, so have I witnessed, at the time of mass, the extraordinary scene of hundreds of persons turning their backs upon Mary to worship Christ in the host, and at the same moment hundreds of others turning their backs upon Christ in the host to worship the Virgin in the image. I have seen the whole congregation divided thus between Christ and Mary at the elevation of the host, which is the most solemn moment of all their worship, when they suppose that, by the process of transubstantiation, the host has become the visible body of Christ among them. I have seen them, I say, at that moment turn their backs on the host, and prefer bowing to the image of the Virgin.

The same writer, in describing the nature of Romanism at Rome, describes the adoration paid to the *Bambino*—that is, "the

Child"—designed as the image of the child Jesus:

It is a little doll, some eighteen inches or two feet long. It is carried about the streets by the priests in a sort of state-coach, and is taken to visit ladies in the hour of nature's sorrow, on the festival called "Blessing the Bambino," amidst a band of nearly ninety priests and monks, the clash of military music, blazing torches, and clouds of incense. When the chief priest raised the idol, five thousand souls prostrated themselves in worship before it. I had never beheld such an awful spectacle; and I feel that never, in the darkest days of the idolatry of heathen Rome, was there any thing comparable to the grossness of this modern idolatry of Christian Rome.

The Church of Rome pretends that she has among her sacred

treasures the wood of the true cross; and it is said there are more pieces of the true cross on the continent than would load a ship of war. We are told by Thomas Aquinas[1] that the cross is to be worshiped with *latria*, with supreme honor: the Missal authorized by Popes Clement and Urban orders the clergy on bended knees to worship the cross: the Breviary commands that the choir shall sing, "Hail, O Cross! our *only hope!* increase righteousness to the pious: *bestow pardon* on the guilty!"—and surely in all this there is the recognition and the practice of the grossest idolatry. In the church of the Lateran you will find

The ark of the Lord which Moses made, and the identical table at which our Lord ate the last supper with his disciples. Upon the high altar are the heads of the apostles Peter and Paul; and though the heads be in Rome, there is a great piece of the skull of St. Peter at Bilboa, and that of Paul is in the possession of the Franciscans in the same city. Hundreds of relics are found among other churches: among which are pretended to be shown part of the manna in the wilderness, some of the blossoms of Aaron's rod, a finger and arm of St. Anna, a piece of the Virgin's veil, the head of St Dennis, which he carried two miles under his arm after it was cut off, the rope with which Judas hanged himself, etc.[2]

The following "relics" are referred to in the Hon. J. W. Percy's "Romanism as it exists at Rome," published in 1847. They are noticed by Mr. Percy, with many others, on the authority of lists or inscriptions seen in different churches, which he mentions:

- Some of the manna with which God fed the Hebrew people in the desert.
- The stone where the Lord wrote the law given to Moses on Mount Sinai.

- Part of the chain of St. John Baptist, forerunner of our Lord Jesus Christ.
- A little piece of the stone where Christ was born.
- A little piece of the stone where our Lord Jesus sat when he pardoned the sins of the Magdalen.
- The great toe of the foot of St. Mary Magdalen.
- Part of the napkin with which our Lord wiped the feet of his disciples.
- One of the pieces of money with which it is believed the Jews paid the treachery of Judas.
- One bottle of the most precious blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and another full of the milk of the most blessed Virgin.
- The finger of St. Thomas the apostle, with which he touched the most holy side of our Lord Jesus Christ after his resurrection.

Mr. Seymour says:

I have handled the rod of Moses; I have looked on Aaron's rod that budded; I have seen the brazen serpent that Moses made; I have held in my hand the stone that killed Stephen; I have seen pieces of the true cross, and the transverse

beam of the cross of the repentant thief. I have seen the nails that pierced the hands and the spear that pierced the side of the Redeemer. I have seen and handled some thousands of the teeth, and pieces of the teeth, and pieces of the bones, and parings of the nails, and locks of the hair of apostles, martyrs, and saints. I have seen the people bow and prostrate themselves before them with every outward act of devotion and adoration, *though I believe in my soul they are the grossest frauds and vilest impostures that ever disgraced or cursed the world.*

Several times in every year the pretended blood of St. Januarius is exhibited at Naples, and the miracle of its liquefaction is performed by the highest ecclesiastic before thousands of besotted spectators. But time would fail to tell about blinking madonnas and the many charms and amulets in universal use among the devotees of Rome.

§ 4. Origin and Development of This Practice.

As this superstition and idolatry is so palpably opposed to

reason and revelation, it is a question of curious interest how it was ever introduced into the Church, and how it is defended.

The worship of relics seems to have preceded that of images. A religious veneration for the relics of martyrs obtained in very early times. It was customary to meet at the tombs of the martyrs to celebrate the days of their martyrdom. The Church at Smyrna was disappointed in not being permitted to take away the body of their martyred Bishop—Polycarp—though they indignantly denied that they would worship it. Helena, the mother of Constantine, bestowed great veneration on the true cross of Christ, which she supposed she had found, and to which miracles were attributed. Gregory Nazianzen extols the virtues of the remains of St. Cyprian, by which miracles were said to be wrought. Vigilantius denounced the veneration which the superstitious of his day paid to the relics of martyrs. Jerome denied the charge with great vehemence:

> Not only do we not worship relics, but not the sun, the moon, angels nor archangels, cherubim nor seraphim, nor any name that is named in this world or in the world to come; lest we should serve the creature rather than the Creator, who is blessed forever. We honor the relics of the martyrs, that we may worship Him whose martyrs they are. We honor the servants that their honor may redound to their Lord's.

St. Augustin uses very unguarded language respecting the relics of saints and miracles wrought by them; yet he denounces the growing superstition of venerating them, carrying them about for sale and the like. There is no superstition in preserving

souvenirs of those whom we esteem. Charles Wesley, allading to Elijah's mantle, beautifully says:

> We gather up with pious care
> What happy saints have left behind.
> Their writings in our memory bear,
> Their sayings in our faithful mind;
> Their works, which traced them to the skies,
> For patterns to ourselves we take.
> And dearly love, and highly prize
> The mantle for the wearer's sake.

Yet how easily may this sentiment be perverted. It is not unreasonably thought that God concealed the place of the burial of Moses lest the Israelites might worship his remains. No one can

blame them for preserving the brazen serpent which Moses erected on the pole, as it was a remarkable type of Christ; yet we read in 2 Kings xviii. 4, that "Hezekiah brake in pieces the brazen serpent which Moses had made; for unto those days the children of Israel did burn incense to it; and he called it Nehushtan"—that is a piece of brass. If we had the wood of the cross on which Christ died, it would be a thousand times better to burn it to ashes than to lift it up for public veneration; it would be sure to receive the worship due to Him who hung upon it. As might be expected, image-worship was not so early and so easily introduced into the Church. The primitive Christians were incessantly contending against the heathen for their idolatry, and so would not be likely to go into it themselves. They had an utter repugnance to the use of images to excite devotion. As this is stoutly denied by Romanists, Bingham has collected overwhelming testimonies from the Fathers that for nearly four hundred years images were forbidden to be used in churches, and that their worship was not tolerated till A.D. 692. In the eighth chapter of the Eighth Book of his "Christian Antiquities" he discusses this question in the most admirable and conclusive manner.

§ 5. Arguments for the Practice Refuted.

As the objections to the worship of images and relics are so potent, so numerous, so powerful, one may be at a loss to inquire how these objections are met by Romanists and by what counter arguments they defend their idolatry. Dr. Wiseman seems horrified at Romanists' being called idolaters. He exclaims: "Idolaters! know ye, my brethren, the import of this

name? that it is the most frightful charge that can be laid to the score of any Christian?" Truly it is, and it is all the worse for those in this condemnation.

That there is no precept requiring image-worship, and no precedent for an example, in the Bible, is clear from the fact that two false renderings of the Vulgate are adduced in the premises. The first is Ps. xcix. 5: *Exaltate Dominum Deum nostrum, et adorate scabellum pedum ejus: quoniam sanctum est.* But the reading is: "Exalt ye Jehovah our God; and bow down at the stool of his feet; holy he

is." *Cf.* ver. 9: "Exalt ye Jehovah our God; and bow down at the mountain of his holiness, for holy is Jehovah our God." The Hebrew means "at the stool," or, as in the liturgical version, "before his footstool." The other passage is Heb. xi. 21: *Adoravit fastigium virgae ejus*: Rheims, "Adored the top of his rod." This ignores the ἐπί of the original, well rendered in our version "worshiped, *leaning* upon the top of his staff:" the natural posture of a sick old man. It is a poor business to represent patriarchs and prophets as adoring stools and staffs.

Those who are not familiar with the finesse of the Roman controvertists will wonder what they can do with the Second Commandment. The Catechism of the Council of Trent thus treats this subject:

"Thou shalt not make to thyself a graven thing, nor the likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or in the earth beneath, nor of those things that are in the waters under the earth: thou shalt not adore them nor serve them." Some, supposing these words to constitute a distinct precept, reduce the ninth and tenth commandments into one. St. Augustin holds a different opinion; considering the two last to be distinct, he refers these words to the first commandment; and this division, because well known and most approved in the Catholic Church, we willingly adopt. As a very strong argument in its favor, we may, however, add the propriety of annexing to the first commandment its sanction, the rewards or punishments attached to its observance or violation—a propriety which can be preserved in the arrangement alone which we have chosen. This commandment does not prohibit the arts of painting or sculpture; the Scriptures inform us that God himself commanded images of cherubim and also the brazen serpent to be made; and the conclusion, therefore, at which we must arrive is that images are prohibited only in as much as they may be the means of transferring the worship of God to inanimate objects, as though the adoration offered them were given to so many gods. To represent the Persons of the Holy Trinity by certain forms under which, as we read in the Old and New Testaments, they deigned to appear, is not to be deemed contrary to religion or the law of God. Who so ignorant as to believe such forms are express images of the Deity? forms, as the pastor will teach, which only express some attribute or action ascribed to God. (Dan. vii. 13;

Heb. i. 14; Matt. iii. 16; Acts ii. 3.) But to make and honor the images of our Lord, of his holy and virginal Mother, and of the saints, all of whom appeared in human form, is not only not forbidden by this commandment, but has always been deemed a holy practice, and the surest indication of a mind deeply impressed with gratitude toward them. This position derives

confirmation from the monuments of the apostolic age, the general councils of the Church, and the writings of so many amongst the Fathers eminent alike for sanctity and learning, all of whom are of one accord upon the subject. But the pastor will not content himself with showing the lawfulness of the use of images in churches, and of paying them religious respect, when this respect is referred to their prototypes; he will do more, he will show that the uninterrupted observance of this practice up to the present time has been attended with great advantage to the faithful; as may be seen in the work of Damascene on images, and in the Seventh General Council, which is the Second of Nice.

Let us analyze this remarkable passage. The reason for blending the Second Commandment with the First is trivial. There are no sanctions to any of the Commandments except the Second, Third, and Fifth: so no argument can be drawn from the sanctions in the Second, *pro* or *con*. The Tenth Commandment, according to our notation, is manifestly one precept, leveled against covetousness, and in the New Testament is frequently cited in brief, "Thou shalt not covet." But we should not object so much to the notation of the commandments, were it not turned to a sinister account. There is a Romish catechism, called "An Abridgment of Christian Doctrine, recommended by authority for the use of the Faithful in England: published by Burns and Lambert, Portman Street, Portman Square." On the front of it is a picture of the Virgin and Child, with an imprimatur by Nicholas, bishop of Melipotamus (Cardinal Wiseman), London, Easter, 1850. The Second Commandment in the word of God is as follows: "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or likeness of any thing that is in the heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth: thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them; for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me, and showing mercy r unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my commandments." (Exod. xx. 4–6.) But instead of this commandment Dr. Wiseman has sanctioned the following in the catechism referred to:

"What is the Second Commandment?

"Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain."

But this is part of the Third Commandment: so that they have thus actually left the Second Commandment out of the catechism

altogether; and to make up the ten, they have divided the tenth into two. Is not this done because Rome knows that she is guilty of idolatry, and therefore tries to strangle the witness that would bear testimony against her? The Rev. Dr. McCaul, in his tract, "Why does the Church of Rome hide the Second Commandment from the People?" (printed in London, in 1850), has shown that of twenty-nine catechisms in use in Italy, France, Belgium, Austria, Bavaria, Silesia, Poland, Ireland, England, Spain, and Portugal (all published under lawful authority), there are twenty-seven in which the Second Commandment is totally omitted, and two in which it is mutilated and only a portion expressed.

Few persons are so simple (though we have found some) as to suppose that the commandment interdicts the making of images and pictures. It is lawful to make representations of any thing except the Godhead; that is absolutely forbidden in Deut. iv. 14–24, where, by the way, the same sanction is appended to the interdict of image-worship. It is not the making of representations of things in heaven, earth, or under the earth; it is the making of them to worship. (*Cf.* Isa. xi.)

It is useless to say the worship does not terminate in the image, but in that which it represents. The less besotted of heathen idolaters say the same thing. But what do the images represent? God? Then that is the foulest idolatry; for he has positively forbidden any representation to be made of himself: "God is a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth." (John iv, 24.) There can be no representation of God; so that if an image, purporting to represent him, is worshiped the worship terminates in the image. Eminent divines of the Church of Rome teach that *latria*, the highest worship, due to God alone, is to be paid to the images of the Trinity and of Christ. Bellarmin states this as one of the opinions in the Church, and as held by Aquinas, Capitan, Bonaventura, and others of high authority. He himself says the worship of *Latria* is only improperly and *per accidens* due to an image; yet he inconsistently maintains that "the images of Christ and the saints are to be venerated, not only by accident or improperly, but also

by themselves properly, so that themselves terminate the veneration, as in themselves considered, and not only as they take the place of their Exemplar." This is grosser idolatry than that of the

Israelites, who, in worshiping the calves which Aaron and Jeroboam made, terminated their worship in Jehovah, who brought them out of the land of Egypt, and not in the calves by which he was represented. For this they are censured. (Ps. cvi. 19, 20.)

The reference to the cherubim and the brazen serpent is utterly impertinent. The cherubim were not idols; they were symbols, probably of angelic power, and belonged to a typical economy. They were not made to be worshiped, or even looked upon by the people. They were put over the ark in the Most Holy Place; no one ever saw them save the high-priest, and he but obscurely once a year. Is that the case with the pictures and statues of the Church of Rome? Are they not exposed everywhere? and are they not worshiped with the most debasing forms of idolatry? So of the brazen serpent. It was a symbol constructed by God's command to answer a specified end and to serve as a type of Christ—not to be worshiped. When in process of time the children of Israel burned incense to it, as Romanists incense their idols, the pious king Hezekiah destroyed it.

When it is urged that the Scriptures inculcate image-worship we roundly deny the assertion, and confront it by numerous passages of holy writ by which it is interdicted—*e. g.*, Exod. xx. 1–6; xxxii.; Lev. xix. 4; xxvi. 1; Deut. iv. 12–26; xvi. 21, 22; xxvii. 15; xxix. 17; 2 Kings xviii. 4; Ps. xcvii. 7; cxv. 4; Isaiah *passim*—so other prophets; Acts xvii. 22–31; Rom. i. 23–25; 1 Cor. viii. 4; x. 7; 1 John v. 21; Rev. ix. 20.

When the catechism says the Fathers were all of one accord in favor of image-worship, it is only necessary to say that, as we have shown, they were all of one accord opposed to it. What "monuments of the apostolic age" are there of image-worship? None whatever. No, nor of the age succeeding the apostolic. Not a vestige of it has been found in the Catacombs. The Ante-Nicene Fathers all denounced it as idolatry. Irenaeus censures the Gnostics for having images and pictures which they crowned and honored, like the Gentiles. Origen quotes Celsus as saying that Christians could not bear temples, altars, and images; and Origen justifies the rejection of them. Athanasius condemns the adoration

of images of the Supreme Being and of angels and inferior intelligences. They used the symbol of the cross, but, says Minutius Felix, "we neither worship crosses nor wish for them." Helena

thought she had found the wood of the cross on which Christ was crucified; but, says Ambrose, she worshiped that great King who was crucified, not the wood on which he was crucified: that, says he, would be a heathenish error, a vanity of impious men. When by degrees pictures and images were introduced into churches, a council was summoned at Constantinople, A.D. 754, called by the Greeks the Seventh General Council, which is rejected by the Latins, which condemned the worship and all use of images. But in the reign of Irene, A.D. 784, the Second Council of Nice was summoned by that Empress, which reversed the decrees of the Council of Constantinople, and ordered that images should be set up and worshiped, though not with *latria*, which is due to God alone. The Galilean Bishops repudiated its decrees, and so did the British. Charlemagne convened a Council at Frankfort, composed of three hundred bishops, for France, Germany, and Italy, who formally rejected the Second Council of Nice, and declared that it was not to be received as the Seventh General Council. It was not received everywhere in the Western Church for five centuries and a half. But in 869 the Emperor Basil convened another Council at Constantinople, attended by about one hundred Eastern Bishops and the Legates of Pope Adrian. This confirmed the worship of images, and is reckoned by Romanists as the Eighth General Council. But it was repudiated by the Eastern Church and for a long time was not acknowledged in the West. The next Council of Constantinople, A.D. 879, repudiated it, and this Council has been in turn rejected by the Western Church. So much for the confirmation of image-worship by "the General Councils of the Church." The Iconoclastic controversy constitutes one of the most revolting portions of Church history.

If any thing can exceed the weakness of the defense of image-worship, it is that of the veneration of relics. The papists claim that miracles are wrought by these relics, and that therefore they ought to be worshiped. We deny both the assertion and the inference. As to the assumed miracles we have discussed them elsewhere. Certain diseases may have been removed by the power of imagination at the touch of the Abbe Paris and under

other circumstances. But this is in accordance with a well-known law of physiology and psychology. But suppose the "holy coat of Treves" did really raise a dead man to life. Is that any reason that it should be worshiped? It never did the like; but Peter did. Was Peter

therefore worshiped?

We are referred to 2 Kings xiii. 21, where a dead man is said to have been restored to life when his corpse touched the bones of the Prophet Elisha. But what has that to do with the question? Jehovah by this miracle attested the ministry of the prophet, that being dead he might yet speak to a people that needed his warnings and instructions. But were his bones ordered to be taken up, enshrined, and worshiped? Take the bones of any saint in the calendar; put a corpse upon them; and if it is restored to life, we will believe that there is virtue communicated by God through the relics; but even then we may not worship them.

2 Kings xxiii. 18 is adduced. There it is stated that Josiah honored the bones of a man of God who was buried at Bethel, and said, "Let them alone; let no man move his bones," while he burned the bones of the idolatrous priests. Why did not the pious monarch encase the bones of the saint in a silver shrine, set them up in the temple, and order them to be worshiped?

Then we are referred to Acts xix. 11, 12: "And God wrought special miracles by the hand of Paul, so that from his body were brought unto the sick handkerchiefs or aprons, and the diseases departed from them, and the evil spirit went out of them." There was usually some outward act connecting the worker of miracles with those on whom the miracles were wrought. But we must be demented, indeed, to think that there was any virtue in clay or spittle or handkerchiefs or aprons. By the miracles thus wrought God established the divine legation of Christ and the apostles. But what has this to do with the matter? Miracles are not now needed, and they are not now wrought: not by the head of John the Baptist (who, by the way, never wrought any miracles when his head was on his body); nor by the handkerchief of St. Veronica, which, according to fame, bears the true likeness of the face of Jesus, as he is said to have wiped his face with it while on the way to Calvary; nor by his sacred coat, which Romanists pretend to have at Treves, and we know not where else, and which they say performs many and astounding miracles; nor—but there is no end to the miracles which

Romanists say are wrought by all kinds of relics—old clothes, bones, hair, nails, and other trumpery, exhibited to gull the besotted people and to aggrandize and enrich the priests.

We repeat, if the greatest miracles were wrought by these relics —and that in our sight, so that there could be no doubt concerning their reality—which has never taken place, and never will take place, still it would be idolatry in us to worship those relics. We might indeed view them as objects of no ordinary interest and preserve them with special care; but we must be deranged in mind to pay them the veneration due to God alone. Yet Romish authors say the relics of the cross, which they pretend to have in possession, the nails, the lance, and the garments of Christ, together with the crucifix, are to be worshiped with *latria*: that is, the worship due alone to God is to be paid to the crucifix and to pretended relics of the cross; and this in the face of the solemn precept, “Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.”

---

1. Bossuet admits that St. Thomas thus teaches.—Œuvres i. 448.↩
2. Philosophic Library for June, 1818, and Catalogue, 1753.↩

Chapter IV.
The Invocation of Saints.

§ 1. Introductory.

The last thing condemned in this article is the invocation of saints. Under the term “saints” are comprehended angels as well as the disembodied spirits of holy men and women. Angels are sometimes called “saints.” (Deut. xxxiii. 2, 3.) So the Church speaks of “Saint Michael and all angels.” Invocation is a general term comprehending every kind of religious worship, as prayer and praise—rhetorical apostrophes, of course, not being included. One not familiar with the history of the Church, and deriving his information solely from the Scriptures, would be surprised and shocked to be told that a large and influential part of the Christian Church actually worships saints and angels. Yet such is the case. Hagiolatry, Mariolatry, Angelolatry—the worship of the saints, the Virgin Mary in particular, and of angels—is absolutely commanded and universally practiced in the Church of Rome.

§ 2. The Roman Position.

272

The Council of Trent has this decree:

> The holy synod commands all bishops, and others whose office and business it is to teach, that they diligently instruct the faithful, concerning the intercession and invocation of saints; teaching them that the saints reigning with Christ do offer up their prayers to God for men: that it is good and profitable humbly to *invocate the saints*, and to fly to *their prayers, help, and assistance*, for the *obtaining of blessings* from God through his Son, Jesus Christ.

It is afterward declared that “if any one shall teach or think contrary to these decrees, let him be accursed.”[1]

In the Creed of Pope Pius IV., to which every Roman Catholic priest subscribes and swears his solemn adherence, is the following: “I do constantly hold that the *saints* reigning together with Christ

are to he invocated."

The Church of Rome has adopted and made her own, in this

matter, one of the leading characteristics of ancient pagan idolatry. It was the creed of the ancient heathen philosophers that demons (*daimones*) by which they understood inferior deities—the spirits of departed heroes and eminent men—were mediators with the great gods, and with the supreme Deity, the father of gods and men.

"The demons," says Plato, "are between God and man, interpreting and carrying things between God and man; bringing before the gods the prayers and sacrifices of men, bringing to men the orders of the gods, and their rewards for their sacrifices. God is not mixed with them, but through them is all converse and intercourse between the gods and men maintained, whether the latter are asleep or awake."

To the same purpose are the words of Apuleius: "All things are thought to be done by the power and authority of the celestial gods, but by the means, despatch, and administration of the demons."

In that remarkable work, "Middleton's Letters from Rome," the entire conformity in this respect between the idolatry of paganism and the adoration of saints is presented with all that force which the facts of history necessarily bear with them. This author tells us that the noblest heathen temple now remaining in the world is the Pantheon, or Rotunda, at Rome, which was dedicated by Agrippa "To Jove and all the gods," and was consecrated by Pope Boniface IV. "To the Virgin and all the Saints." "With this single alteration," he says, "it serves exactly for the Popish as it did for the pagan worship. For as in the old pagan temple every one might find the god of his country, and address himself to that deity whose religion he was most devoted to, so it is the same thing now: every one chooses the patron whom he likes best. And one may see here different services going on at the same time at different altars, with distinct congregations around them, just as the inclinations of the people lead them to the worship of this or that particular saint." And as it is in the Pantheon, so it is in all the heathen temples that remain at Rome. They have only pulled down one idol to set up another, changing rather the name than the object of their worship. Thus, the little temple of Vesta, near the Tiber, is now possessed by the Madonna of the Sun; that of Fortuna Virilis by Mary the Egyptian; that of Saturn by St. Adrian;

that of Romulus and Remus by two other brothers, Cosmus and Damianus; that of Antonius the godly by Laurence the saint.

There is another melancholy analogy between ancient paganism and modern Romanism, which is worthy of notice. It is this: In the ancient mythology, as every classical reader knows, it was taught that there were gods who presided over particular countries and cities, and gods who were the patrons of particular trades and professions; and so it is in the calendar of the Popish saints. We are all familiar with the names of St George of England, St. Andrew of Scotland, and St. Patrick of Ireland. So there is St. Sebastian of Portugal, St. James of Spain, St. Denis of France, and St. Mark of Venice. So with regard to trades: St. Luke is the patron of painters, St. Crispin of shoemakers, St. Catherine of scholars, and St. John of lawyers. St. Anthony has the charge of swine, and St. Gallus of geese and sheep.

§ 3. The Romish Distinction of Degrees or Kinds of Worship.

As this system of saint-worship is so prominent in the Church of Rome, and is so vehemently denounced by Protestants, let us see by what arguments it is defended, and how they are answered. Romanists draw a distinction between *latria*, *hyperdulia*, and *dulia*: the first being supreme worship, due to God alone; the second an intermediate worship, due alone to the Virgin Mary; the third an inferior worship, due to saints and angels. Now the Scripture recognizes no such distinctions. It does recognize a distinction between religious worship and civil worship; the latter being simply the outward respect shown by one person to another, especially to superiors—*e. g.*, Matt. xviii. 26; Luke xiv. 11. So in the old marriage service: "With my body thee I worship." No idea of religious worship is here suggested. The barbarous term *hyperdulia* is not found in the Bible. The other terms are used promiscuously in the Old Testament, and are applied to the worship of God—*e. g.*, Deut. xxviii. 47, 48; 1 Sam. vii. 3., where Samuel exhorts Israel to serve God only—δουλεύσατε in the LXX. The term δουλεύω is used in reference to the worship of God in Matt. vi. 24; Luke xvi. 19; Acts xx. 19; Rom. vii. 6, 25: xii. 11; xiv. 18; xvi. 18; Col. iii. 24; 1 Thess. i. 9;

cf. Rev. xxii. 3; "His servants, δοῦλοι, shall serve him, λατρεύσουσιν αὐτῷ." Even Bellamiin and Velasquez acknowledge that the distinction is unscriptural, the words being promiscuously used. Nicholas Serrarius says: "It is one and the same virtue of religion which containeth both *latria* and *dulia*." So it is, and Christ says: "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." (Matt. iv.)

§ 4. Mediation of Redemption and of Intercession.

Romanists make another distinction, namely, between Mediation of Redemption and Mediation of Intercession; but this is utterly unscriptural. "There is one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all." (1 Tim. ii. 5, 6.) And there is no other mediator but he. He bases his intercession on his sacrifice. (Rom. viii. 34; Heb. x. 14.) "We have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous; and he is the propitiation for our sins." He who atones for our sins intercedes for us on high. No saint or angel can take his place at the mercy-seat any more than on the cross.

§ 5. The Saints More Compassionate Than Christ.

Romanists pretend that the saints, especially Saints Anna and Mary, are more compassionate and approachable than Christ. When the poor Romanist is taught, "Christ is too great, too awful, too exalted, too stern in his justice, to be approached by you, a guilty sinner;" when Dr. Wiseman says, "The saints look down upon you with sympathy; you may turn to them to use the influence they necessarily possess with God toward assisting their frail and tempted brethren on earth:"[2] what, we ask, is the inevitable tendency of such teaching, but that men will be led to think that there are others in heaven more ready to sympathize with their necessities than "the Good Shepherd, who gave his life for the sheep?" And is it so that Jesus is not a sufficient and ever-compassionate Advocate? Is it not he whom we hear saying, "Behold, I stand at the door and knock: if any man hear my voice,

and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me?" (Rev. iii. 20.) Is not this the true Daysman, God and man, possessed of the nature of him who has been offended and of him who offends, and therefore

alone qualified to plead? Is not this the true Kinsman Redeemer, bone of our bone, and flesh of our flesh? And are we to be afraid to commit our cause to him alone? Must we go to others, that they may plead with him for us? Is not he "the Mediator of the New Testament?" (Heb. ix. 15.) And is it not written: "If any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous?" (1 John ii. 1.) Does he not declare: "No man cometh unto the Father, but by me" (John xiv. 6); "if ye shall ask any thing in my name, I will do it" (John xiv. 14)? And if there be a "throne of grace" to which we are invited, why are we to "come boldly?" Is it because Mary or Peter or Paul or any saint or angel is there to mediate for us? No: it is because "we have not an High-priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities," but one who "was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin." "Let us therefore," says the Apostle, "come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need." (Heb. iv. 15, 16.)

Surely this ought to settle the question. Not only does Scripture testify that "there is none other name under heaven whereby we must be saved" but that of Christ, but it teaches that we need no other Saviour than him. No, blessed Jesus! be it thine to undertake our cause: Thou art able to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by thee: Thou art the Friend that sticketh closer than a brother: Thou art not ashamed to call us brethren:

Friend of the friendless and the faint,
Where shall I lodge my deep complaint?
Where but with thee, whose open door
Invites the helpless and the poor?

§ 6. Prayers of Earthly and of Heavenly Saints.

But it is said saints pray for us on earth, and we ask an interest in their prayers; and why may we not ask them to intercede for us

in heaven? and why may they not do so? Simply because there is no warrant for it in Scripture. They cannot hear our prayers and praise. They know not our wants; and therefore it is as absurd as it is impious for us to invest them with the attributes of Deity and the functions of the Mediator. A loving bond of sympathy is cemented between the members of the mystical body of Christ on earth, by their mutual prayers, and we

naturally seek to assist those for whom we pray: this is reason enough for our praying for one another while we are in the flesh. But how does this apply to the saints in glory? If it were lawful for them to pray for us, and for us to pray for them—which would not be idolatry, though we consider it superstition—how does it appear that it is lawful for us to pray to them, or to ask them to pray for us?

§ 7. Saints and Angels in the Presence of God.

It is replied that saints and angels are in the immediate presence of God, and can behold in him, as in a mirror, all our wants, and so can be induced to seek their supply. We admit that the saints as well as the angels are in the immediate presence of God in heaven; and we regret that Bishop Browne indorses the notion of some of the Fathers and others, that they are in an intermediate place, as well as an intermediate state, between death and the resurrection. They are with Christ, in Paradise, in heaven, in the presence of God and the angels. The Church to which Bishop Browne belongs says in the burial service: “Almighty God, with whom do live the spirits of those that depart hence in the Lord, and with whom the souls of the faithful, after they are delivered from the burden of the flesh, are in joy and felicity,” etc. The talk about Hades, as the abode of disembodied spirits, is antiquated nonsense. Their bodies are in Hades, that is, the grave, and their spirits are in heaven. But does that make them omniscient? The notion of the schoolmen that they see in the face of God, as in a mirror, all things which are done upon the earth, is too subtle and too absurd to require much notice. Nobody can tell what it means. If it means that God tells them of our condition and wants, to excite their sympathy and induce them to pray for us, that seems a roundabout

way of accomplishing the end—the supply of our wants. The vain circuit has not the slightest countenance in the Bible.

§ 8. Romish Proofs from Scripture Considered.

But they tell us that the Scriptures do inculcate the mediation and invocation of saints and angels. That is a startling statement, seeing that the Bible is so full of denunciations of idolatry in all its forms, condemning in set terms the "worshiping of angels" (Col. ii. 18), and recording the fact that angels declined the worship which was inconsiderately about to be made to them.

278

The Catechism of the Council of Trent says of the angels:

> Their intercession, therefore, we invoke, because they always see the face of God, and are constituted by him the willing advocates of our salvation. To this their invocation the Scriptures bear testimony. Jacob wished, nay compelled, the angel with whom he wrestled to bless him, declaring that he would not let him go until he had blessed him; and not only did he invoke the blessing of the angel whom he saw, but also of him whom he saw not: "The angel," says he, "who delivered me out of all evil, bless these children." (Gen. xxxii. 26; xlviii. 16.)

The case of the angel who appeared to Joshua, and who was worshiped by him, is also adduced by Romish writers. (Josh. v. 14, 15.) Now they ought to know, and they must have known, that the "angel" in these cases was none other than the great Angel of the Covenant, who frequently appeared in that way to the ancients, as many of the Fathers, as well as the most learned divines of all communions have held, and still hold, as in Charles Wesley's immortal hymn:

> Come, O thou Traveler unknown.

But even if Jacob had considered the angel, or man, who wrestled with him, a created intelligence, human or angelic, recognizing him as a messenger from God, he might have asked for his blessing without any idea of worshiping him; and afterward might have expressed a wish that the angel might bless his grandchildren too. We frequently pray God to send his angels to guide and protect us, without dreaming of rendering them any worship, or of invocating them, except in rhetorical apostrophes, as in Ps. ciii. and cxlviii.,

where the angels and all other creatures, animate and inanimate, are called on to praise the Lord. The numerous cases in which it is said that worship was rendered to angels and men are only instances of civil respect common to this day in the East. Abraham and Lot did not know that the “men” whom they thus worshiped were of a higher order of beings: they “entertained angels unawares.” (Gen. xviii. 2; xix. 1; Heb. xiii. 2.)

Cardinal Wiseman, among the five hundred passages in which prayer is mentioned in the Bible, finds but four in the Old Testament (exclusive of two in Maccabees and Tobit, which are Apocryphal books of no authority) and five in the New Testament, from which he can infer that angels were invoked by ancient saints. The first four passages are taken from the Book of Daniel, and are as follows:

“And I heard a man’s voice between the banks of Ulai, which called, and said, Gabriel, make this man to understand the vision.” (Dan. viii. 16.)

“Yea, while I was speaking in prayer, even the man Gabriel, whom I had seen in the vision at the beginning, being caused to fly swiftly, touched me about the time of the evening oblation.” (Dan. ix. 21.)

“Then said he unto me. Fear not, Daniel: for from the first day that thou didst set thine heart to understand, and to chasten thyself before thy God, thy words were heard, and I am come for thy words.” (Dan. x. 12.)

“And at that time shall Michael stand up, the great prince which standeth for the children of thy people.” (Dan. xii. 1.)

With regard to the first passage, where one man is said to speak to another, there is no mention of prayer being addressed to either. In reference to the other passages, there is not the least intimation that prayer had been addressed to any other than to God himself. Accordingly, we find in the sacred record that the angel Gabriel was caused to fly swiftly, and touched Daniel at the time of the evening oblation; and he said, “O Daniel! I am now come forth to give thee skill and understanding.” But to whom had that prayer been addressed? Why, to God himself—that sublime and beautiful prayer containing the words: “O Lord, hear; O Lord, forgive; O Lord, hearken and do; defer not, for thine own sake, O my God: for thy city and thy people are called by thy name.” (Dan. ix. 19.)

In these passages, then, all that is taught about angels is just the doctrine that is more fully developed in the New Testament, and which is stated in the words of the Apostle Paul to the Hebrews: "Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation?" (Heb. i. 14.)

But let us see what are the five texts which Dr. Wiseman, in his lectures, adduces from the New Testament. The first is Luke xv. 7, 10, "Likewise I say unto you, there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth."

Angels, it is argued, know what is done on earth, and therefore prayers may be addressed to angels. But what is the substance of the passage? There are three beautiful parables, two besides that of the prodigal son. The first is that of the lost sheep. When the shepherd has brought it back on his shoulders

rejoicing, he calls his friends and neighbors, and says: "Rejoice with me; for I have found my sheep which was lost." The second is that of the lost piece of money; and when the woman has swept the house diligently until she has found it, she calls her friends and neighbors together, and says: "Bejoice with me; for I have found the piece which I had lost." Thus, so far as the parable teaches, as the shepherd tells his neighbors of the finding of the wandering sheep, and as the woman tells her neighbors of the lost piece of money restored and found, so God reveals to his angels that another sinner has repented, and this causes their joy. It amounts to the same thing if the angels, as ministering spirits, bear the news to heaven.

Dr. Wiseman founds an argument on Matt. xxii. 30: "For in the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven." Invocation is addressed by Romanists to disembodied *spirits*; but this passage refers only to saints when *they shall receive their glorified bodies*, and therefore does not bear on the subject before us. But even if we did admit that the spirits of the just made perfect are *now* equal to angels, we ask. What has that to do with the assertion that our prayers are to be addressed to them?

A third text is adduced by Wiseman, Matt. xviii. 10: "Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones; for I say unto you, That in heaven their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven." Still it will be observed that there is not one word authorizing prayers to angels. Allusion is made to Rev. v. 8,

"golden vials full of odors, which are the prayers of saints." But the reference of the whole verse is to the mode of worship under the Old Testament dispensation, (Neh. xii. 27; Ps. cxli. 2), and the "vials" evidently allude to the prayers offered up under the gospel dispensation, through "the Lamb in the midst of the throne," by the ministers and members of the Church.

Last of all we are referred to Rev. viii. 3, 4: "And another angel came and stood at the altar, having a golden censer; and there was given unto him much incense, that he should offer it with the prayers of all the saints upon the golden altar which was before the throne. And the smoke of the incense, which came with the prayers of the saints, ascended up before God out of the angel's hand."

281

In the Old Testament, as already noted, the Lord Jesus Christ receives the name of the Angel—the Angel of God's presence—the Angel that spoke to Moses as God from the burning bush—the Angel that appeared to Joshua as the captain of the Lord's host—the Angel that wrestled with Jacob unto the breaking of day, who was recognized to be God, and to whom Jacob prayed when he was dying, as the God before whom his fathers had walked, as the Angel which redeemed him from all evil, and whom he asked to "bless the lads."[3] It is Christ, therefore, who comes and stands at the altar. There is "given unto him much incense;" as the great High-priest he has gone as our Intercessor within the veil, that he should "offer it with the prayers" (or add it to the prayers) "of all the saints" when they ascend up to heaven, for they otherwise would be rejected of the Father. Thomas Aquinas expressly declares that Christ is spoken of in this passage as "the Angel of God's presence;" and the Jesuit Viegas says: "All interpreters do confess that by the Angel is meant our Lord Christ."[4] And of the accuracy of this interpretation there can be no doubt, when we remember that the imagery is here drawn from the ancient temple: that the *golden censer* pertained to the high-priest alone—nay, that at the *golden* altar in the *holiest of all*, the high-priest officiated alone, while the people prayed without. (Heb. ix. 3, 4, 7.) And, therefore, this passage proves the very opposite of what it is adduced by Dr. Wiseman to establish, even the blessed truth that there is no advocate and mediator in heaven but one—the High-priest of our profession, the Lord Jesus Christ.

Here, then, are all the passages which this eminent

controversialist quotes from Scripture in order to prove the propriety of addressing invocations and prayers to saints and angels in heaven; and not one of them, as we have seen, supports the doctrine.

There is, indeed, one example of prayer offered to a disembodied spirit. But who offered the prayer? where was it offered? and with what success? It was offered by the rich man in hell, and Abraham granted him not his request: small encouragement for the invocation of saints. So there is an

example of worship about to be offered to an angel; but he abruptly and vehemently declined the honor. John says: "And when I had heard and seen, I fell down to worship before the feet of the angel which showed me these things. Then saith he unto me, See thou do it not; for I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren the prophets, and of them which keep the sayings of this book: worship God." (Rev. xxii. 8, 9; *cf.* xix. 10.) John evidently intended to make such an expression of reverence as was common in regard to superiors; but the angel sternly rebuked him, lest it might be pleaded as a precedent for that idolatry against which our article protests. "Worship God," said the angel. So Peter declined that outward reverence from Cornelius, because there was danger of the same mistake, Cornelius being a heathen. And though it is not recorded, yet we may be sure that Daniel would not allow Nebuchadnezzar and his courtiers to entertain any religious sentiment in the "worship" which in Oriental style they paid him. (Dan. ii. 46.) Indeed, the firm protest of Daniel and his three friends against idolatry seems to have wrought its designed effect upon Nebuchadnezzar, who became a devout worshiper of the one living and true God. The attempts of Romish polemics to establish the worship of saints and angels by Scripture testimony only show the hopelessness of all such efforts.

§ 9. Patristic Authorities.

As might be expected, they fall back on the authority of the Fathers. Now if they could in truth plead such authority it would be nothing worth, as the Fathers erred most grievously in many things. But it betrays unusual hardihood to cite the Fathers in favor of

hagiolatry, when it is well known that they were earnest and uniform in their opposition to it. Even Cardinals Perron and Richelieu, and other learned Romanists, admit that the invocation of saints was not practiced for the first three centuries; and for the reason, they say, that praying to saints would have been too much like pagan idolatry. It would have hindered the spread of the gospel, and the heathens would have used it as an *argumentum ad hominem*! Truly they would, but they never did, for the very good reason that the primitive Christians worshiped none but God alone. Bingham, in his "Antiquities of the Christian Church," Book XIII., heads his

third chapter: "That in the ancient Church, religious worship was given to no creature, saint or angel, but to God alone." He fully establishes: 1. That the ancients declare universally against giving religious worship or adoration to any creature or being which by nature is not God. 2. That in particular they reject the worship of saints and angels as idolatrous and unlawful. 3. That there is no mention of it but in the practice either of heretics or heathens, whose idolatry is aggravated upon the account of this practice. He says: "Justin Martyr often tells the Empress in his 'Apology,' that Christians could worship none but God alone," etc. So Theophilus, Bishop of Antioch: "God's laws command the worship of the true God alone." So Tertullian: "They asked these things of the true and living God, and they could ask them of no other but him, because he alone was able to give them." There is a unanimous consent of the Fathers on this subject. Athanasius argues from 1 Thess. iii. 11 that Christ must be God, and not an angel or any other creature, since he is invoked in conjunction with his Father. Origen positively denies that even the Jews or Christians gave any religious worship to angels. Athanasius says Peter forbade Cornelius to worship him, and the angel forbade St. John when he would have worshiped him: "wherefore it belongs to God only to be worshiped; and of this the angels are not ignorant, who though they excel in glory are yet all of them creatures, and are not in the number of those to be adored, but of those who adore the Lord." The following is the language of Epiphanius, in the fourth century, in reference to the religious honor which had begun to be paid to the Virgin; and which, originating with some Arabian women, was called the "heresy of the women:"

Who of the prophets ever allowed that a man should be worshiped, much less a woman? Though the Virgin be a chosen vessel, she is but a woman. The old error shall not reign among us to leave the living God, and to worship things that he has made. For if he will not suffer the angels to be adored, how much less the daughter of Joachim and Anna, who was born to them as other mortals are born, of a father and mother.

It is hardly necessary to say that Gregory Nazianzen, who was the first of the Fathers in whose writings is found any address to the dead; did not intend any infringement of catholic doctrine or usage in so doing. He expressly declares that all worship of a creature is idolatry, and charges it upon the Arians

who worshiped Christ while they denied that he was of one substance with the Father. In his rhetorical apostrophes to the souls of Constantius, and his own sister Gorgania, he expresses a doubt whether they could hear him, and in neither case did he pray to them. He was too sensible and too orthodox to do that.

§ 10. The Action of Councils.

It seems superfluous to note the argument of the Romanists that hagiolatry is commended by the Councils of the Church. The first General and Provincial Councils were composed of the Fathers, who denounced it as idolatry. The Second Council of Nice (A.D. 787) had sanctioned the worship of images and saints, but, as we have seen, this is not to be reckoned among the General Councils of the Church. Seven years after the Council of Frankfort forbade both the worship of images and of saints. That Romish Councils have subsequently inculcated both is too true; and it is for this, as much as for any other departure from the truth, that all the Reformed Churches in the world repudiate its authority and stand aloof from its communion—denouncing the worship of saints, in connection with purgatory, indulgences, and the worship of images and relics, as a fond thing, vainly invented, and grounded upon no warrant of Scripture, but repugnant to the word of God.

---

1. Conc. Trid. Sess. 25.↩

2. Thirteenth Lecture, p. 98.↩
3. Compare Gen. xlviii. 16–20 with Hosea xii. 3–5, and both with Mal. iii. 1; and it will clearly appear that “The Angel” or “Messenger” was not a created being, but that he was Christ.↩
4. Apoc. cviii. Sect. 2.↩

Part III.

Article XV.
Of Speaking in the Congregation in such a Tongue as the People Understand.

285

It is a thing plainly repugnant to the word of God, and the custom of the Primitive Church, to have public prayer in the church, or to minister the sacraments, in a tongue not understood by the people.

Introduction.

This is precisely the same as Article XXIV. of the Anglican Confession, except that “understood by” is substituted for “understanded of.” If Mr. Wesley had omitted this article, it would not have mattered much; for it is a thing plainly repugnant to common sense, as well as to the word of God and the custom of the primitive Church, to conduct divine worship in a language not understood by the people. It is singular that the title of the article states the right, while the article itself condemns the wrong.

Chapter I.
The Practice and Its Apology.

286
It may be well first to inquire who are guilty of this absurdity, and why they do it.

§ 1. The Religionists Guilty of this Practice.

The Jews celebrate public worship in the Hebrew. They do so because of the great veneration in which they hold this sacred tongue, and because they teach it in all their synagogue schools. It is presumed that many of the people understand it, though the great bulk of them know but little of it.

The Mohammedans have their worship in Arabic, the language of their prophet. Brerewood says:

> Not only in Arabia and Egypt and Barbary and Palestine and Syria and Mesopotamia, in which parts the Arabic tongue is become the vulgar language, the Alchoran is read, and their public devotions exercised, in Arabic; but also in Greece and Natolia, and other parts of the Turkish dominion, where the Greek and Turkish and Slavonian tongues are vulgar, as also in Persia, in Tartary, and India, where they have other native and peculiar languages, the Mohammedans read the Alchoran (which they supposed were profaned if it were translated into vulgar tongues), and perform their public devotions in that language.

Speaking "of those sects of Christians that celebrate their liturgies in learned and foreign tongues, which the vulgar people do not understand," Brerewood says, "I find only three languages wherein they are all performed, viz., the Greek, the Latin, and the Chaldee or Syriac tongues." In the Chaldee, or Syriac, he says, are celebrated the liturgies of the Nestorians, Jacobites, Copts, Maronites, and the Zocotorini; of none of whom is the Syriac the vernacular.

Those Christians that celebrate their liturgies in the Greek tongue—meaning ancient Greek—are the Grecians themselves, all who speak modern Greek; the Syrian Melchites, whose vernacular is the Arabic; the Gregorians, whose language Brerewood says is of a

middle temper between Tartarian and Armenian; the Circassians, and the monks of all monasteries of the Greek religion. We should think, however, that those who understand modern

Greek would find but little difficulty in joining in the ancient Greek service.

Those who celebrate their liturgies in Latin comprehend all who are of the Roman Communion in America, in Africa, in Europe (except the Slavonians), and in Asia (except the Maronites, in Syria, and the Christians of St. Thomas, in India, who use the Syriac).

§ 2. The Apology Offered for the Practice.

This singular phenomenon has been accounted for and defended by the following considerations:

1. These three languages were those which were spoken in those parts of the world where Christianity first took root. The Scriptures were written or translated and liturgies composed in them, so that they were considered in a manner sacred, as the Jews considered the Hebrew and the Mohammedans the Arabic. The Christians of those parts naturally wanted to retain the very words of the Apostles and Fathers.
2. These languages were a long time becoming obsolescent, so that it was not easy to fix upon a precise time when the old tongues should give way to new dialects.
3. It was argued, and is still argued, that the faith and worship are better preserved by retaining these old tongues than by substituting them by the vernacular languages. This, however, is a delusion. The faith and worship of the Church have degenerated far more among those who retain the old languages in their liturgies than among those who use the vernacular. The latter still retain the Scriptures, Liturgies, etc., in their original tongues, and constantly refer to them to settle the meaning of any expressions.
4. The nations speaking those ancient tongues wished to impose their languages upon all who came under their dominion. Especially was this the case with the Romans. The Latin became the common tongue of Europe. Ecclesiastics

recognized Rome as their center; and so they continued to use the Latin after the nations of Europe had modified it into Italian, French, Spanish, etc.

5. But the great reason is the aggrandizement of the hierarchy. It made their segregation more complete. Wherever they went they celebrated public worship in the same tongue. This tended to unify the Church. There was romance and poetry in it. The

Miserere, De Profundis, Jubilate, Te Deum, Paternoster, Credo, and *Gloria Patri*, in one sacred tongue, sounded round the world like the drum-roll of the British Empire, which is the Briton's boast. If there be any force in this argument, or in any other, we do not feel it, and know not how to break it, except by showing that while the custom seems vastly absurd it is also plainly repugnant to the word of God and the custom of the primitive Church.

Chapter II.
The Practice Condemned by Scripture and the Primitive Church.

§ 1. By Scripture.

289

Let us refer to the word of God. It is only incidentally—we had almost said, by chance—that there is an allusion to this subject in the Scriptures. Uninspired men would never have imagined it necessary to interdict a custom so absurd. But the Holy Spirit knew what is in man and of what he is capable, and hence there is one trenchant passage which settles the question, we were going to say, without controversy or cavil; but no question can be so settled—men will cavil at every thing, oppose every thing; but to every candid mind the language of the apostle in 1 Cor. xiv. is the end of controversy on this subject.

The Corinthians, who were endowed with the miraculous gift of tongues for the confirmation and spread of Christianity, were beginning to make an ostentatious display of this wonderful accomplishment. For this the apostle rebukes them: "Except ye utter by the tongue words easy to be understood, how shall it be known what is spoken? for ye shall speak into the air." "For if I pray in an unknown tongue, my spirit prayeth, but my understanding is unfruitful. What is it then? I will pray with the spirit, and I will pray with the understanding also: I will sing with the spirit, and I will sing with the understanding also. Else when thou shalt bless with the spirit, how shall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned say Amen at thy giving of thanks, seeing he understandeth not what thou sayest? For thou verily givest thanks well, but the other is not edified. I thank my God, I speak with tongues more than you all: yet in the Church I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that by my voice I might teach others also, than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue. . . . Let all things be done unto edifying. . . . For God is not the author of confusion, but of peace, as in all Churches of the saints." If it was folly for the Corinthians to speak with foreign tongues, when there

was no occasion for it and

none to interpret them, what folly must it be to make that the law of the Church all over the world. It is useless to speak of the Latin as being universally understood: it is rather universally unknown. There was a time when many of the clergy knew little or nothing of the Latin which they mumbled and muttered in the mass. Some know none too much of it now, and not one in a thousand of their hearers (if indeed they can hear any thing in the mass) understand a sentence of it. Paul decides the question: “If I know not the meaning of the voice, I shall be unto him that speaketh a barbarian; and he that speaketh shall be a barbarian unto me.”

§ 2. By the Primitive Church.

Let us see what was the custom of the primitive Church. Brerewood says:

> I find it recorded in Durandus (but upon what warrant and authority I cannot find) that till the time of Hadrian the Emperor (that is, about one hundred and twenty years after Christ) their liturgies were all celebrated in the Hebrew tongue; and that then the Oriental Church began first to celebrate them in Greek.

By Hebrew he understands the Syriac then in use among the Jews. He thinks it likely that the apostles composed liturgies in the Syriac for the use of converted Jews, who took them with them in their dispersion. But there is no proof of this, and much less that Gentile, Greek-speaking, Christians used these Syriac formularies in their churches.

“That anciently divine service was always performed in the vulgar tongue understood by the people,” Bingham proves:

1. From plain testimonies of the ancients asserting it.
2. From the people’s joining in psalmody and prayer, and making their proper responses in the liturgy.
3. From the exhortation of the Fathers to the people, to hear and read and pray with understanding.
4. From the references made by the Fathers in their sermons to the prayers and lessons in the service of the Church.
5. From the Scriptures being translated into all languages from

the first foundation of Churches.

6. From the use of the order of interpreters in the Church.
7. From the custom of having Bibles laid in churches for the people to read in private.
8. From the general allowance granted to all men to have and read the Scriptures in their mother tongue, which privilege was never infringed by any but the heathen persecutors.
9. From the liberty granted to children and catechumens to join in the public

prayer and read the Scriptures.

10. From the form and license of the ordination of readers in the Church.

Those who are curious to see all these points established are referred to “Bingham’s Antiquities of the Christian Church,” Book xiii., chap. 4. As no reputable disputant will contest these positions, it is needless to discuss them in this place.

It was the custom of the primitive Church, therefore, to conduct public worship in the vernacular tongues; in this it has been followed, says Brerewood, by “the Armenians, Habassians, Muscovites, with Russians, Sclavonians, and Protestants.”

§ 3. Conclusion.

Papists say this is not a matter of dogma, but of discipline, and so may be varied or entirely abolished. Yet they have allowed but slight variation from the rule. When Catherine de Medicis and Ferdinand approached the Council of Trent on this subject, their demands were not granted; they were mildly rejected: the Council re-enacting existing rules, only anathematizing those who say that mass is to be exclusively celebrated in the vernacular. The Council assigned the stereotyped reasons for holding on to the old rule:

1. That as modern languages change, the terms of worship might be altered, and so give rise to heresies.
2. The greater number of the priests would not be able to say mass in other than their native countries.
3. The holy mysteries would be profaned by celebrating them in

the vulgar tongue.

Bellarmin says there is no necessity of the people's understanding what the priest says; God understands it: absolution and reconciliation can be conferred just as well without their understanding the language since the sacraments work *ex opere operato*. By using the vernacular any one might act as priest, and this would degrade the priesthood; Latin would be forgotten, and they would not be able to read the Scriptures (in the Latin Vulgate) nor the Latin Fathers!

This much must be said, that the defense of this absurd, unscriptural, and anti-patristic custom is worthy of it. No more need be added.

Part IV.

Article XVI.
Of the Sacraments.

292

Sacraments, ordained of Christ, are not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession, but rather they are certain signs of grace, and God's good-will toward us, by the which he doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our faith in him.

There are two sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the gospel; that is to say, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord.

Those five, commonly called sacraments—that is to say. Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and Extreme Unction—are not to be counted for sacraments of the gospel, being such as have partly grown out of the corrupt following of the apostles, and partly are states of life allowed in the Scriptures, but yet have not the like nature of Baptism and the Lord's-supper, because they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God.

The sacraments were not ordained of Christ to he gazed upon, or to he carried about; but that we should duly use them. And in such only as worthily receive the same, they have a wholesome effect or operation; but they that receive them unworthily purchase to themselves condemnation as St. Paul saith, 1 Cor. xi. 29.

Introduction.

This article is the same as Article XXV. of the Anglican Confession, with a few suggestive changes and omissions which will be noted in due place.

Burnet says:

There is a great diversity between the form of this article, as it is now settled, and that published by King Edward, which began in these words: "Our Lord Jesus Christ gathered his people into a society by sacraments, very few in numbers,

293

most easily to be kept, and of most excellent signification; that is to say

Baptism and the Supper of the Lord." There is nothing in that edition instead of the paragraph concerning the other five pretended sacraments. Next comes the paragraph which is here the last, only with the addition of these words after operation: "Not as some say, *ex opere operate*, which terms, as they are strange and utterly unknown to the Holy Scripture, so do they yield a sense which savoreth of little piety, but of much superstition;" and in conclusion the paragraph comes with which the article does now begin; so that in all this diversity there is no real difference; for the virtue of the sacraments being put in the worthy receiving excludes the doctrine of *opus operatum* as formally as if it had expressly been condemned; and the naming the two sacraments instituted by Christ is upon the matter the rejecting of all the rest.

The articles agreed on between the Lutheran and Anglican Reformers in 1538 had one article (IX.) to the same purport with this, though that went on to speak of Infant Baptism. Article XIII. of the Augsburg Confession furnished the substance of the first and last paragraphs of our article:

> Concerning the use of the sacraments our Churches teach that they were instituted not only as marks of a Christian profession among men, but rather as signs and evidences of the divine disposition toward us, tendered for the purpose of exciting and confirming the faith of those who use them. Hence the sacraments ought to be received with faith in the promises which are exhibited and propounded by them. They therefore condemn those who maintain that the sacraments produce justification in their recipients as a matter of course (*ex opere operato*), and who do not teach that faith is necessary, in the reception of the sacraments, to the remission of sins.

The Latin recensions show a close agreement. For "badges and tokens" the Latin of the Anglican has one word, *notae*, which is also the word used in the Augsburg. The word rendered "exciting" in the latter is *excitandam*; so the word rendered "quicken" in the former is *excitat*: so *confirmandam* in the Augsburg corresponds to *confirmat* in the Anglican, which has two words in tho English—"strengthen and confirm," one word explaining the other. Jo. Elis ought not in his Latin version to have put *vivificat* for *excitat*, because of its ambiguity: in the Scriptures it generally means to raise to life, to give life to that which had it not before, as Rom. viii. 11: "Shall quicken, *vivificabit*, our mortal bodies;" Rom. iv. 17: "God who quickeneth the dead"—*vivificat mortuos*. The idea intended, by *excitat, excitandam*, is to excite to more lively action that which is already active; as the recipient of the sacraments comes to them

with faith, which is excited and strengthened by the participation.

Chapter I.
The Sacraments in General.

294

The first paragraph in our recension reads thus:

> Sacraments, ordained of Christ, are not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession, but rather they are certain signs of grace, and God's good-will toward us, by the which he doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our faith in him.

§ 1. Mr. Wesley's Changes.

The slight changes and omissions made by Mr. Wesley are judicious, as, "are" for "be," and the omission of the words "sure witnesses and effectual" [between "certain" and "signs of grace"]. "Certain signs of grace and God's good-will toward us" expresses all that is necessary. The terms "sure witnesses and effectual signs" were introduced in opposition to Zuinglianism, but that is opposed in the next sentence; and though the word "effectual," may be used in an orthodox sense, yet it may be employed to countenance the *opus operatum* error. It is enough to say in the article that by the sacraments "God doth work invisibly in us." In devotional poetry, when the connection shows the sense in which the terms are employed, it is all very well:

> The sacred, true, effectual sign,
> Thy body and thy blood it shows;
> The glorious instrument divine
> Thy merry and thy strength bestows.

Bishop Browne says: "The whole article is introductory to the six [four in our Confession] next in order after it, and is rather concerned with definitions than aught else." That is a very good observation, only we should hardly use the word "definitions:" rather general statements, or descriptions. So Bishop Burnet: "It was most natural to begin thus with a description of sacraments in general."

§ 2. The Definition of a Sacrament.

We must go to the Catechism for a definition of a Sacrament, where we have the best ever conceived:

295

How many sacraments hath Christ ordained in his Church? Two: Baptism and the Supper of the Lord.

What mean you by the word sacrament? I mean an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace, given unto us, ordained by Christ himself, as a means whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us thereof.

Nothing can be more to the point than that. There is nothing wanting, nothing redundant, nothing ambiguous in this definition. It agrees precisely with the description and statement in the article, and throws great light upon it.

1. According to the Catechism a sacrament is a "sign." It is something outward and visible, addressed to the senses, especially to the sight. As such, it is a sign of something that is not apprehensible by the senses, an inward and spiritual grace: "the sanctification of the spirit" in Baptism; "the communion of the body and blood of Christ" in the Lord's-supper. The "sign," in those who "show it forth," is a badge of their profession as Christians.
2. A sacrament is an ordinance of divine institution. It is "ordained by Christ himself," not by the Church. So the article asserts sacraments are "ordained of Christ," and none else are recognized as "sacraments of the gospel." This restricts their number to two: Christ ordained none besides.
3. A sacrament is a means of grace, an instrument to convey the grace which it represents: *a* means, not *the* means, as if there were no other. He who worthily receives baptism, receives with it and by it the sanctifying grace which it signifies. He who worthily receives the Lord's-supper spiritually eats the flesh and drinks the blood of Christ, which it represents. So the article affirms that by the sacraments "God doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our faith."
4. A sacrament is a pledge of the grace which it signifies. It ratifies and confirms the grace and good-will of God toward

us, as the article expresses it. It is a pignorative ordinance; this is its grand distinction. It is not only a *signum significans*, or act which notifies or declares something, but it is also *signum confirmans*, an obsignation: the parties concerned in covenant transaction set their seal to it, and thus God confirms his grace to us, and our faith in him is confirmed and our promise of obedience ratified. This is well set forth in a familiar hymn by Dr. Watts:

296

The promise of my Father's love
Shall stand forever good:
He said, and gave his soul to death,
And sealed the grace with blood.

To this dear covenant of thy word
I set my worthless name;
I seal th' engagement to my Lord,
And make my humble claim.

Thy light, and strength, and pardoning grace,
And glory, shall be mine;
My life and soul, my heart and flesh,
And all my powers, are thine.

The Westminster Catechism somewhat expands the subject in its definition of a sacrament, but it is to the same effect:

A sacrament is a holy ordinance, instituted by Christ in his Church, to signify, seal, and exhibit unto those within the covenant of grace the benefits of his mediation; to strengthen and increase their faith, and all other graces; to oblige them to obedience; to testify and cherish their love and communion one with another; and to distinguish them from those that are without.

§ 3. The Word Sacrament.

The word *sacrament* casts but little light on the subject. Indeed, it may be doubted whether any thing has been gained by introducing it into theology. It is not a Scripture word, though *sacramentum* is used in the Vulgate (Eph. v. 32; Rev. i. 20) for "mystery" [Greek, μυστήριον]. It comes from *sacer*, sacred, and

denotes any thing sacred: hence a sacred deposit, or pledge; also an oath, especially the military oath which Roman soldiers took to be faithful to their country and to obey their general.

The Fathers frequently apply the word in the general sense to any thing sacred. Cyprian speaks of the many sacraments contained in the Lord's Prayer, and calls the three hours of prayer a sacrament of the Trinity. Tertullian says the heathen charged the Christians with "the sacrament of infanticide." The Fathers spoke of the two sacraments, water and chrism, in Baptism; and of two also, bread and wine, in the Lord's-sapper.

Still, the word had also a restricted use. Pliny, in his celebrated Epistle 97 to Trajan, says the Christians were accustomed to meet together on a certain fixed day before sunrise, when they sung hymns to Christ as to God, and bound themselves by a sacrament not to commit any wickedness. Pliny possibly meant by sacrament simply an oath; but it is generally thought

he referred to the Eucharist, as Pliny repeated what the Christians themselves had told him.

Tertullian applies the word to the baptismal vow; and he calls baptism *Sacramentum Fidei, Aquae, Lavacri*; and the Lord's-supper *Sacramentum Eucharistiae*. So Augustin and other Latin Fathers. The Greek Fathers use the word mystery with similar latitude, and with similar restriction.

§ 4. Historical.

As to the sacraments ordained by Christ, the Fathers spoke in terms of exaggeration concerning their virtue, laying the foundation for the Romish theories of baptismal regeneration and transubstantiation, of which we shall have more to say when we come to the following articles. The Reformers generally leaned too much in that direction, while they renounced the gross views held by Romanists. One of the most zealous of the Reformers, however, seems to have gone to the opposite extreme. Zuinglius is represented as entirely rejecting sacramental grace and holding that sacraments are bare signs, outward tokens of Christian profession, but in no sense means of grace. He says:

A sacrament is an external symbol, by which we testify what we are, and what is our duty, just as one who bears a national badge testifies that he belongs to that nation. A sacrament is the sign of a sacred thing; when, therefore, I speak of the sacrament of Christ's body, I mean no more than that bread which is the figure and type of Christ's body.

Luther violently opposed Zuinglius for holding these views, and in so doing came very near affirming the Romish doctrine of the sacraments. Calvin tried to steer a middle course, but it is very difficult to define his views on this subject. He says:

Though the sacraments are figures, yet they are not naked and empty figures, but having their truth and substance united to them; not only representing, but offering, grace. We ought never to separate the substance of the sacraments from the sacraments themselves. We ought not indeed to confound them, but to rend them asunder is absurd.

The Anglican Reformers, as Bishop Browne says, "symbolized not with Zuinglius, but with Calvin, though not deriving their views from him."

The Socinians generally adopt the views accredited to Zuinglius, and so do many of the orthodox English Non-conformists.

It may be doubted whether Zuinglius has been fairly represented. One can hardly think that he denied that the sacraments

are means of grace. He certainly denied that they were such means of grace as Luther represented them. As to Calvin's *via media*, we have never seen any one yet that understood it. When he says, "We ought never to separate the substance of the sacraments from the sacraments themselves; we ought not indeed to confound them, but to rend them asunder is absurd," he says what Zuinglius and every other man of common sense would say, only perhaps in less ambiguous language. For example, we suppose Zuinglius would say that as baptism symbolizes regeneration, every one who is baptized ought to realize the thing signified: he should not only be born of water, but also of the Spirit. So every one who partakes of the bread and wine in the other sacrament ought to feed upon Christ by faith, as that is what is thus symbolized. There is no other real, spiritual presence of Christ in the Eucharist but that.

§ 5. The First Paragraph Directed Against the Zuinglian View.

But, howsoever, the first paragraph in oar article is evidently directed against the so-called Zuinglian view of the sacraments. Sacraments are not mere badges or tokens of Christian men's profession: they are symbols of an inward and spiritual grace, and are important means whereby we receive it, and also a pledge to assure us thereof.

None can come to the baptismal font or the Lord's table in a becoming manner without realizing the grace symbolized in the ordinance, which is a visible sign and certain pledge of God's good-will toward us. By the great truths which the sacraments exhibit, accompanied by the influence of the Holy Spirit, our faith is greatly excited and confirmed. The gospel addressed to our ears in preaching is addressed to other senses also in the sacraments, which are thus specially adapted to our condition while our spirits are enshrined in bodies of flesh and blood. Whatever Quakers and others may say to the contrary, we need such simple ordinances in which our senses are addressed, and through this medium spiritual subjects are brought down to our comprehension.

My Saviour, God, my sovereign Prince,
Reigns far above the skies;
But brings his graces down to sense,
And helps my faith to vise.

Chapter II.
The Five Pseudo-Sacraments.

§ 1. The Two Sacraments Ordained of Christ.

299

The second paragraph of the article reads thus:

> There are two sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the gospel; that is to say, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord.

By saying there are two sacraments ordained by Christ, the article virtually says there are but two: so that if there were no succeeding clause repudiating the five additional spurious sacraments which have been foisted in to make "the Seven Sacraments," this clause is sufficient to restrict the number to two.

There has always been in the Church of England a hankering by the High-church divines after "the Seven Sacraments," giving the prominence to Baptism and the Lord's-supper as formally ordained by Christ in the gospel, but allowing the other five as ordained by the apostles and practiced by the Church. The answer in the Anglican Catechism to the question, "How many sacraments hath Christ ordained in his Church?" seems to look in this direction: "Two only, as generally necessary to salvation; that is to say, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord." The part of the Catechism which refers to the sacraments was prepared at the instance of King James I., by Bishop Overall, then Dean of St. Paul's, and was allowed by the Bishops. It is a source of satisfaction to us that Mr. Watson, in compiling our Catechism, omitted the ambiguous clause, "as generally necessary to salvation."

§ 2. The Five Spurious Sacraments Repudiated.

But as the articles which follow treat of the two sacraments severally, we will pass on to notice the third paragraph of the article, in which the spurious sacraments are repudiated.

> These five commonly called sacraments—that is to say, Confirmation,

Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and Extreme Unction—are not to be counted for sacraments of the gospel, being such as have partly grown out of the *corrupt* following of the apostles, and partly are states of life allowed in the Scriptures, but yet have not the

300

like nature of Baptism and the Lord's-supper, because they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God.

This is the same as in the English book, except that the latter has this language: "But yet have not like nature of Sacraments with Baptism and the Lord's-supper, for that they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God." Ours is an improvement.

Our objection to calling the five things here specified sacraments, is not because of the word itself. This, as we have seen, is not a Scripture term: it may be, as it has been, applied to a great many things considered sacred. But the objection is to its restriction to "Seven," if it be extended beyond "Two." The word should be confined to the two "sealing ordinances" instituted by Christ for perpetual observance in the Church, or else it should be used indefinitely like the words rites, ceremonies, and the like.

It is absurd and mischievous to rank these other five with the two sacraments "ordained of Christ our Lord." Of these five, three "have grown out of the corrupt following of the apostles," to wit, "Confirmation, Penance, and Extreme Unction;" and two "are states of life allowed in the Scriptures," to wit, "Orders and Matrimony;" "but yet have not the like nature of Baptism and the Lord's-supper, because they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God."

§ 3. Historical.

The Romanizing party in the Church of England venture to call all these sacraments, and they administer four of them as such, and long for the restoration of the fifth to make the number seven, as in "our sister Church of Rome." Thus Bishop Forbes calls "the Unction of the Sick the lost pleiad of the Anglican firmament," and "recommends its restoration." There must be seven stars, of course.

The Greek Church holds to the Seven *Mysteries*, but they do not all correspond to the Romish sacraments. Brerewood says: "It rejects Extreme Unction and Confirmation." These statements are

reconciled by noting that Confirmation is administered by priests as well as bishops, and to infants as well as adults, and that in immediate connection with Baptism. Instead of extreme unction they have *Euchelaion*, the oil of prayer, which

may be administered to any person who is sick, and that repeatedly, in order to his recovery.

The Syrian Churches, in like manner, speak of seven Mysteries or Sacraments; but they use the term in a loose sense, and their authorities differ in regard to the particular offices to be included within the sacred number.[1]

The Romish Church is very emphatic in maintaining the Seven Sacraments, and considers it damnable heresy to deny that there are seven. The Schoolmen, before the twelfth century, contended about their number. But in that century Peter of Lombardy determined their number, thus: Baptism, the Lord's-supper. Confirmation (of catechumens), Ordination, Extreme Unction, Auricular Confession (Penance), and Wedlock. He was followed in this by the leading authorities of Rome, and it was established as a dogma by the Council of Florence, A.D. 1442, and re-affirmed by the Council of Trent A.D. 1547.

§ 4. Romish Arguments for the Number Seven.

The Romish doctors exercise their ingenuity in adducing arguments for the number seven.

1. Scripture: Ex. xxv., the seven lights of the golden candlestick: the seven sacraments being thus symbolized as they are so many lights which illuminate the Church. So Prov. ix.: "Wisdom," that is, Christ, "hath built her house," the Church, "and hath cut out her seven pillars," to wit, the Seven Sacraments. This is unanswerable.
2. The traditions of the Fathers alluded to are not to the point, as has been seen.
3. The decrees of Councils are alike impertinent. The Ecumenical Councils say nothing about the number seven. The Councils of Florence and Trent are of no authority. We object to them because they enacted such canons as these.

They pretended to prescriptive right, and their divines argue that because their councils so decreed, it must always have been so, and must remain so forever.

4. They even go so far as to argue for this number from fanciful analogies—*e. g.*, seven is the number of perfection. There are seven days in the week; seven cardinal virtues; seven mortal sins; seven planets; seven stages in a man's life. This last analogy

was adduced by Thomas Aquinas, and indorsed by the Florentine fathers. It is fully set forth in the Catechism of the Council of Trent, pp. 106, 107.

["It was supposed," says Dr. Pope, "that each was symbolized by or symbolized one of the seven cardinal virtues, Faith, Love, Hope, Wisdom, Temperance, Courage, Righteousness; they were explained by the analogy of the spiritual life with the physical, as to Birth, Growth into adult age, Nourishment, Healing, Reproduction, Instruction, Death; and so forth. . . . It is remarkable that the Greek and the Roman Communions, differing in so much besides, agree in accepting seven sacraments. Both base their acceptance on the authority of the Church as interpreting the will of Christ, and vindicate them as enfolding and hedging round and sanctifying the whole of life at its several stages: Baptism is the sanctification of birth, Confirmation of adult life. Penance of the life of daily sin, the Eucharist of life itself, Orders of legitimate authority, Matrimony of the Church's law of continuance and increase, and Unction of the departure hence."[2]]

These arguments have one merit: if they are utterly worthless, they are unanswerable.

To show that the dogma of the Seven Sacraments is binding upon every Romanist, we refer to the Creed of Pope Pius IV., the authorized symbol of the Romish Church.

> I also profess that there are truly and properly seven sacraments of the new law, instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord, and necessary for the salvation of mankind, though not all for every one, to wit, baptism, confirmation, eucharist, penance, extreme unction, orders, and matrimony, and that they confer grace; and that of those, baptism, confirmation, and orders cannot be reiterated without sacrilege.

The Reformed Churches, with great unanimity, hold that there

are but two sacraments. The Lutheran Reformers of the sixteenth century restricted the word sacrament to Baptism and the Lord's-supper. This induced the Council of Trent to issue its canons and curses in regard to the Seven Sacraments. Henry VIII. also wrote his book on "The Seven Sacraments," in opposition to Luther, and by it gained from the Pope the title of "Defender of the Faith." The number of the sacraments is not specified in the Augsburg Confession. In the Apology for that Confession, by Melanchthon, it is said that nothing depends upon

the use of the word, or upon the *number*, if the thing itself is rightly understood so that human institutions are not ranked with divine.

Bellarmin, Oberthür, and some other eminent Romish divines admit that Baptism and the Lord's-supper are the most important of the sacraments, and Oberthür confesses that Christ expressly and immediately appointed only two sacraments, thus agreeing with the Protestants, but that Christ authorized the Church to add others—which is popery again.

The English Reformers did not all at once settle down upon the Protestant doctrine on this subject. The Articles about Religion, A.D. 1536, and the Necessary Doctrine, A.D. 1543, in King Henry's reign, speak of seven sacraments. The First Book of Homilies, A.D. 1547, in King Edward's reign, speaks of "the Sacrament of Matrimony," and that too after speaking of the "Sacrament of Baptism." Cranmer's Catechism speaks of three sacraments as instituted by Christ—Baptism, Absolution, and the Lord's-supper. But the true Protestant doctrine was crystallized in this article and in the Catechism.

Let us now notice these supernumerary sacraments, and see if the Church is not right in rejecting them, as sacraments.

§ 5. Confirmation.

The Catechism of the Council of Trent says:

> This sacrament is called confirmation because, if no obstacle is opposed to its efficacy, the person who receives it, when anointed with the sacred chrism by the hand of the bishop, who accompanies the unction with these words, "I sign thee with the sign of the cross, and confirm thee with the chrism of solvation, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," is confirmed in strength by receiving new virtue, and

becomes a perfect soldier of Christ.

The canons of the Council of Trent on Confirmation are as follows:

1. Whoever shall affirm that the confirmation of the baptized is a trifling ceremony, and not a true or proper sacrament; or that formerly it was nothing more than a kind of catechising, in which the neighboring young persons explained the reasons of their faith before the Church: let him be accursed.
2. Whoever shall affirm that they offend the Holy Spirit who attribute any virtue to the said chrism of confirmation: let him be accursed.
3. Whoever shall affirm that the usual administrator of confirmation is not the bishop only, but any ordinary priest: let him be accursed.

The chrism is composed of oil of olives and balsam, consecrated by a bishop. This is the *matter* of confirmation; and it symbolizes

the manifold graces of the Holy Spirit which are thus imparted. It is put on the forehead in the form of a cross, by a bishop: the only *administrator*. The *form* of confirmation consists of the words already cited, together with prayer and imposition of hands, a slap on the cheek, a kiss of peace, and other puerile ceremonies: a godfather for a male and a godmother for a female subject, etc. The *subject* may be one newly baptized, if not younger than seven years. It is not necessary to say any thing more as to the character of this *sacrament*. Let us see how it is defended.

Though there is not the slightest hint in Scripture of the sacrament, or even the *rite* of confirmation, yet Romanists have the hardihood to appeal to the Scriptures for its support.

The Roman Catechism says:

Describing this admirable effusion of the Holy Spirit, St. Luke says, “And suddenly there came a sound from heaven, as of a mighty wind coming, and it filled the whole house where they were sitting;” and a little after, “and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost.” From these words we may infer that as the house in which they were assembled was a type and figure of the Church, the sacrament of confirmation, which had its existence for the first time on that day, is intended for the use of all the faithful. This is also an easy inference from the nature of the sacrament. It is the earnest desire of the Catholic Church, the common mother of all, that those whom she has regenerated by baptism may be brought to perfect maturity in Christ. This happy consummation can be accomplished only through the mystic unction of confirmation; and hence it is clear that this

sacrament is equally intended for all the faithful. This extraordinary efficacy of confirmation the Scriptures beautifully express by a metaphor: "Stay you in the city," says our Lord, *speaking of this sacrament*, "until you be indued with power from on high."

Now, how can any one answer such *reasoning* as that? It is an insult to one's understanding to reply to *proofs* so irrelevant. The outpouring of the Spirit on the disciples, on the Day of Pentecost, was the Sacrament of Confirmation! Pray, who was the *bishop* that administered it? Does Luke say any thing about the unction on the forehead, the percussion of the face, the imposition of hands on the head, the mystic words—the matter and form of this wonderful sacrament? Not a syllable. Then, it is a rich idea: *Apostles* receiving the sacrament of confirmation, though who was the bishop to administer it we are not informed! Mind, the Catechism says expressly that the *sacrament* of confirmation had its existence for the first time on the Day of Pentecost; and it is bound, therefore, to show not merely that the Holy Spirit in his miraculous gifts was poured out upon the disciples

on that day, which is what Luke says, but also that a bishop was there to anoint with unction, lay on hands, speak the mystic words, "I sign thee with the sign of the cross," etc., without which matter and form there is no sacrament. Everybody who is not daft knows that there was nothing of all this connected with the Pentecostal prodigy recorded in Acts ii.

But the Catechism refers us to Acts viii. 14, 16:

> That bishops alone are the ordinary ministers of this sacrament is the doctrine of Scripture, we read in the Acts of the Apostles that when Samaria had received the gospel, Peter and John were sent to them that they might receive the Holy Ghost; "for he was not yet come upon any of them, but they were only baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus." Here we find that he who administered baptism, having only attained the degree of deacon, had no power to administer confirmation; its administration was reserved to a more elevated order of the ministry—that is, to the apostles alone. Whenever the sacred Scriptures speak of this sacrament they convey to us the same truth.

That is so: but then they never "speak of this sacrament." As so much capital has been made out of what Peter did in Samaria [by Anglicans as well as Romanists], let us look a little into the case.

1. Who were Peter and John? Were they bishops? They certainly were not. Apostles were not bishops. They are never called bishops in the Scriptures. The duties of the apostles were incompatible with those of the Episcopate.
2. Are bishops apostles? They are not. They are nowhere so styled in the Scriptures. As we have shown elsewhere, they were invested with none of the functions peculiar to apostles.
3. Did Peter sign the catechumens at Samaria with unction and the figure of the cross on their foreheads, using the formula of the *sacrament*, "I sign thee with the sign of the cross," etc., adding the slap in the face, the kiss of peace?
4. For what purpose did Peter and John lay hands on these Samaritan neophytes? Was it not that they might "receive the Holy Ghost," just as the disciples received the Holy Ghost on the Day of Pentecost, in the house of Cornelius, and at Ephesus, when the Apostle Paul laid his hands upon the twelve disciples of John, and the Holy Ghost came on them, and they spake with tongues, and prophesied (Acts viii.; x.; xix.)? Whatever increment of faith and hope and love and joy and peace may have been realized by those who received this divine *charism* a child can see that the transaction was of a miraculous

character, designed to attest the divine legation of the apostles, and to inaugurate the new dispensation. In the case of the pentecostal converts, and those in the house of Cornelius, the Holy Spirit was thus miraculously poured out upon them without the imposition of the apostles' hands, though it was in attestation of their apostleship; and in the other cases the imposition of hands took place merely to visibly connect the apostles with the subjects of the miracle. The impartation of "this gift" was restricted to the apostles for the reason assigned, and ceased forever when they passed away.

Let us see miraculous gifts imparted by a Romish bishop, or for that matter any other gift, and we will believe in his sacrament of confirmation; till then we shall consider it "a corrupt following of the apostles:" like the mimicry of a monarch by a madman.

There are no other texts of Scripture adduced in favor of the

sacrament of confirmation, except some which in the Vulgate speak of *unguentum in capite*: the ointment poured on the head of Aaron which ran down on his beard (Ps. cxxxiii.); the *confirmat, unxit*, and *signavit* of 2 Cor. i. 21, 22: "Now he which stablisheth us with you in Christ, and hath anointed us, is God; who hath also sealed us, and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts." So *confirmantes animas discipulorum*: "confirming the souls of the disciples." (Acts xiv. 21.) So Judas and Silas, being prophets (were they bishops too?), "exhorted the brethren with many words, and confirmed them"—*confirmaverunt*. (Acts xv. 32.) Here is the sacrament of confirmation with a witness. We should like to know what bishop confirmed Aaron? What bishop confirmed, anointed, and sealed the apostles and believers spoken of in 2 Cor. i.? and where is the evidence that any thing else was done in the other cases mentioned in the Acts but what any minister does now, as Paul and Barnabas, Judas and Silas, established believers in the faith by instruction and exhortation? "Ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things. . . . The anointing which ye have received of him abideth in you, and ye need not that any man teach you; but as the same anointing teacheth you of all things, and is truth, and is no lie, and even as it hath taught you, ye shall abide in him." (1 John ii. 20, 27.) This divine unction, forsooth, is made of oil and balsam, blessed by an archbishop, applied to the forehead by a bishop with the mark of the cross, imposition of

hands, a slap on the face, and a formula of incantation. What contemptible twaddle is all this! One could not be justified in having any patience with such pitiful travesty of the Holy Scriptures —substituting a puerile ceremony for the spiritual anointing from the Holy One, which enlightens and saves the soul.

It is due to Roman controversialists to say that they do not lay much stress on the Scripture testimony for the sacrament of confirmation; they depend principally upon that of the Fathers and Councils of the Church.

Thus the Romish Catechism says:

> That confirmation has all the conditions of a true sacrament has been at ail times the doctrine of the Catholic Church, as Pope Melchiades and many other very holy and ancient pontiffs expressly declare.

After citing a number of names, the Catechism impudently

says:

Not only was it instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ, but as St. Fabian, Bishop of Rome, testifies, the chrism and the words used in its administration were also appointed by him: a fact of easy proof to those who believe confirmation to be a sacrament, for all the sacred mysteries are beyond the power of man, and could have been instituted by God alone.

There is a bald and bold begging of the question. Only believe that Christ instituted it, and you can not doubt it to be a sacrament; only believe it to be a sacrament, and you can not doubt that Christ instituted it.

Elliott says:

Here the sophistry of this authoritative Catechism is manifest, as the *proof* that the sacrament was instituted by Christ is drawn from the credulity of the ignorant! It is a fact of easy proof to those who believe confirmation to be a sacrament. Certainly there is no Scripture warrant to show that it is one. Hence among Romanists themselves there is much diversity of opinion respecting the *time* when the institution took place, some referring it to a Council, others to the Last Supper, others to the time between the resurrection and ascension. (See Dens, de Confir., No. 3, Art. V., p. 252.)

The Catechism further says:

A mixture of oil and balsam constitutes the matter of confirmation; and this mixture of different elements at once expresses the manifold graces of the Holy Ghost and the excellence of this sacrament. That such is its matter the Church and her councils have uniformly taught; and the same doctrine has been handed down to us by St. Denis, and by many other Fathers of authority too great to be questioned, particularly by Pope Fabian, who testifies that the apostles received the composition of chrism from our Lord, and transmitted it to us.

It requires no small patience to reply to such bold statements and evident falsehoods. As Elliott says:

The letter ascribed to Fabian has been proved to be a forgery, as is acknowledged by Dens, who says: “This Epistle of Fabian is now, among learned men, esteemed as supposititious and apochryphal, as also the other decretal letters before Pope Siricius.” Thus the principal support which this fabricated statement of the authors of that Catechism rests on is a forged letter ascribed falsely to this Pope.

And what are the Clementine Canons and Constitutions but forgeries? And yet this infallible Catechism, which condenses and

popularizes the canons and decrees of the infallible Council of Trent, published by the authority of an infallible Pope, Pius V., indorses these outrageous forgeries, and cites them as the principal authority for this *bogus* sacrament.

The ancients indeed say a great deal about confirmation, and indeed speak of it as a sacrament, but then they use this word in the general, loose sense already explained. They considered this rite merely complemental of baptism. In the second century they introduced a great many ceremonies to make baptism, as they thought, more impressive, as trine immersion in a state of nudity; the use of salt, honey, oil, etc. Bingham says:

> Immediately after the persons came up out of the water, if the bishop was present at the solemnity, they were presented to him in order to receive his benediction, which was a solemn prayer for the descent of the Holy Ghost upon such as were baptized; and to this prayer there was usually joined the ceremony of a sacred unction and imposition of hands, and the sign of the cross; whence the whole action many times took these names: *χρίσμα*, the unction; *χειροθεσία*, the imposition of hands; and *Σφραγίς*, the sign or seal of the Lord, which are names much more common among the ancients than that of confirmation. But by all these names they understood one and the same thing, which was the bishop's prayer for the descent of the Spirit upon persons newly baptized. This was always administered together with baptism if the bishop, who was the ordinary minister, were present at the action. But if he was absent, as it usually happened to be in churches at a distance from the mother church, or when persons were baptized in haste upon a sick-bed, then confirmation was deferred till the bishop could have a convenient opportunity to visit them.

Bingham adduces a good many patristic testimonies in proof of this statement, and also of the fact that this confirmation was given to infants at their baptism, as complemental of that sacrament. If the bishop were not present, this rite was postponed till his services could be procured. The permanent separation of confirmation from baptism is generally traced to the thirteenth century. The Greeks still connect it with the baptism of both adults and infants.

Here, then, is the origin of this wonderful sacrament of confirmation. It originated in a superstitious addition to the simple

rite of baptism, and has been perpetuated for the exaltation of the hierarchy of the Church.

Speaking of the reception of heretics and schismatics into the Catholic Church, Bingham says:

But yet the Church, though she neither repeated the outward form of baptism, nor always the unction of chrism, especially in the western parts where St. Austin, Optatus, Alcimus, and Avitus lived, yet she always gave a new imposition of hands with prayer, to implore the descent of the Holy Ghost upon them. And though this was separating confirmation from baptism, yet it was only in an extraordinary case, when the Church was not capacitated to do otherwise. In other cases she always joined these two ceremonies together, as well in infants as adult persons, as I suppose the allegations and proofs alleged in this chapter, do abundantly show to any candid reader, beyond possibility of contradiction.

Bingham closes the first chapter of his Twelfth Book with this sensible paragraph:

But some will be apt to object that if this were the case, then all Churches at present, as well Protestant as Papist, differ from the practice of the primitive Church in this particular, that now they never administer confirmation to infants, but only to adult persons, who can confirm their baptismal vow in their own persons. And this difference is readily owned as to practice. But then, if the question be about right, which is the more suitable and agreeable practice? and whether we ought not to conform in every circumstance to the practice of the primitive Church? I suppose every Church in this case is best judge for herself, what is most for the edification of her children. And as no Church now thinks herself under any obligation to give the eucharist to infants, because the primitive Church for eight hundred years did so, so neither does any Church judge herself bound to give confirmation to infants for the same example; though some learned persons have pleaded for both, as Bishop Bedell among the Protestants, for the communion of infants, Matthew Galen among the Papists, for giving them confirmation; while others judge the modern practice the more edifying way, and think there are no sufficient arguments to engage the Church to make an alteration.

The Greek Church administers the unction and the eucharist to the newly baptized, even to infants.

The Lutheran and Reformed Churches practice confirmation, but do not consider it a sacrament. It is administered by the pastor to young persons when they are of a suitable age to ratify the baptismal vow. Calvin approved it. He says (“Institutes,” iv. 19):

I sincerely wish that we retained the custom which was practiced among the ancients before this abortive image of a sacrament made its appearance. For it was not such a confirmation as the Romanists pretend, which cannot be mentioned without injury to baptism; but a catechetical exercise, in which children or youths used to deliver an account of their faith in the presence of the Church.

Calvin's followers on the Continent have carried out his wishes. But it is somewhat singular that none of the Calvinistic Churches of the primitive type, or the Scotch Presbyterians and their offshoots in England, Ireland, and America, practice confirmation; nor do any of the dissenting Churches in England, or their offshoots in America or elsewhere—except some of the Baptists. And it is rather strange, too, that none of the Methodist Connections practice this rite.

When Mr. Wesley organized the Methodist Episcopal Church in America, and revised the English Liturgy for its use, he omitted the order of confirmation. He had seen it so grievously abased in the Church of England, to say nothing about the Church of Rome, that we suppose he thought it might well be spared, especially as there is no scriptural authority for it, and the Methodist Church made other provisions for the introduction of persons into full communion.

The Methodist Episcopal Church, South, however, in view of primitive usages, allows of the laying on of hands, with a benediction, in the baptism of both infants and adults, and we never baptize either without practicing this beautiful, simple, and suggestive rite. Our Church has also printed a form for the "Reception and Recognition of Church-members," which is in substance a confirmation service. No harm, perhaps, would result from giving it that title and adding to the service the imposition of hands.

The Church of England and its offshoots vary in their notion of confirmation: some, considering it a sacrament *of the Church*, if not "of the gospel," would be very willing to use unction, etc., like the papists; while others consider it merely a decent rite for the ratification of the baptismal vow, preparatory to the communion. Many who are of this opinion would be pleased to see the words in the Collect for this service removed: "upon whom, after the example of thy holy apostles," as they seem to imply that the apostles laid on hands for this purpose; but we have seen that the passages alluded to in Acts viii.; Acts xix.; Heb. vi. refer to a very different matter: the impartation of the Holy Spirit through the laying on of the apostles' hands, whereby the subjects thereof were enabled to perform miracles in attestation to the truth of Christianity—a power, we presume, which can be no more wielded by an Anglican than by a Romish bishop.

311

The second spurious sacrament which has come from the corrupt following of the apostles is penance. The Romanists define "penance as a sacrament wherein a person who has the requisite dispositions receives absolution at the hands of the priest, of all sins committed since baptism."

In the fourteenth session of the Council of Trent are these canons:

Whoever shall deny that, in order to the full and perfect forgiveness of sins, three acts are required of the penitent, constituting as it were the matter of the sacrament of penance, namely, contrition, confession, and satisfaction, which are called the three parts of penance; or shall affirm that there are only two parts of penance, namely, terrors wherewith the conscience is smitten by the sense of sin, and faith, produced by the gospel, or by absolution, whereby the person believes that his sins are forgiven him through Christ: let him be accursed.

Whoever shall affirm that the words of the Lord our Saviour, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whosesoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosesoever sins ye retain, they are retained," are not to be understood of the power of forgiving and retaining sins in the sacrament of penance, as the Catholic Church has always from the very first understood them, but shall restrict them to the authority of preaching the gospel, in opposition to the institution of this sacrament: let him be accursed.

Whoever shall deny that sacramental confession was instituted by divine command, or that it is necessary to salvation; or shall affirm that the practice of secretly confessing to the priest alone, as it has been ever observed from the beginning by the Catholic Church, and is still observed, is foreign to the institution and command of Christ, and is a human invention: let him be accursed.

Whoever shall affirm that the priest's sacramental absolution is not a judicial act, but only a ministry to pronounce and declare that the sins of the party confessing are forgiven, so that he believes himself to be absolved, even though the priest should not absolve seriously but in jest; or shall affirm that the confession of the penitent is not necessary in order to obtain absolution from the priest: let him be accursed.

Whoever shall affirm that we can by no means make satisfaction to God for our sins, through the merits of Christ, as far as the temporal penalty is concerned, either by punishments inflicted on us by him, and patiently borne, or enjoined by the priest, though not undertaken of our own accord, such as fastings, prayers, alms, or other works of piety; and

therefore that the best penance is nothing more than a new life: let him be accursed.

The Roman Catechism thus descants upon the matter and form of this sacrament:

It differs from the other sacraments in this: the matter of the other sacraments is some production of nature or art; but the acts of the penitent, contrition, confession, and satisfaction, constitute, as has been defined by the Council of Trent, the matter as it were (*quasi materia*) of the sacrament of penance. They are called

parts of penance, because required in the penitent, by divine institution, for the integrity of the sacrament and the full and entire remission of sins. When the holy synod says that they are "the matter as it were," it is not because they are not the real matter, but because they are not, like water in baptism and chrism in confirmation, matter that may be applied externally. With regard to the opinion of some, who hold that the sins themselves constitute the matter of this sacrament, if well weighed, it will not be found to differ from what has been already laid down: we say that wood which is consumed by fire is the matter of fire, and sins which are destroyed by penance may also be called with propriety the matter of penance.

The form also, because well calculated to excite the faithful, to receive with fervent devotion the grace of this sacrament, the pastor will not omit to explain. The words that compose the form are: "I ABSOLVE THEE," as may be inferred not only from these words of the Redeemer: "Whatsoever you shall bind upon earth shall be bound also in heaven;" but also from the same doctrine of Jesus Christ, as recorded by the apostles. That this is the perfect form of the sacrament of penance, the very nature of the form of a sacrament proves. The form of a sacrament signifies what the sacrament accomplishes: these words, "I absolve thee," signify the accomplishment of absolution from sin through the instrumentality of this sacrament; they therefore constitute its form. Sins are, as it were, the chains by which the soul is fettered, and from the bondage of which it is "loosed" by the sacrament of penance. This form is not less true, when pronounced by the priest over him who, by means of perfect contrition, has already obtained the pardon of his sins. Perfect contrition, it is true, reconciles the sinner to God, but his justification is not to be ascribed to perfect contrition alone, independently of the desire which it includes of receiving the sacrament of penance. Many prayers accompany the form, not because they are deemed necessary, but in order to remove every obstacle which the unworthiness of the penitent may oppose to the efficacy of the sacrament. Let then the sinner pour out his heart in fervent thanks to God, who has invested the ministers of his Church with such ample powers! Unlike the authority given to the priests of the Old Law, to declare the leper cleansed from his leprosy,

the power with which the priests of the New Law are invested is not simply to declare that sins are forgiven, but, as the ministers of God, really to absolve from sin; a power which God himself, the Author and Source of grace and justification, exercises through their ministry.

Now a child can see that this is no sacrament. It was not instituted by Christ or his apostles: it has neither matter nor form of divine institution.

The *quasi materia* of the Council of Trent is no *matter* at all: it is not an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace. And where in the Scriptures do we read that the priest is told to pronounce the awful words, *Ego te absolvo a peccatis tuis in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti*, "I absolve thee from thy sins, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost?"

313

It is a rare thought that our *sins* maybe the matter of the sacrament. They are a fine symbol of pardoning grace.

The substitution of penance for repentance is a crying perversion, fraught with immense mischief. The word "penance," used in the Vulgate for repentance, is no rendering of the origin Greek *μετάνοια*; the verb from which it comes means to change the mind so as to change the life. Athanasius says: "Μετάνοια is so called because it transfers the mind from evil to good." This change is of course always connected with grief for the evil done. (2 Cor. vii. 9–11.)

Our Catechism accordingly says: "True repentance is a grace of the Holy Spirit, whereby a sinner from the sense of his sins, and apprehension of the mercy of God in Christ, doth with grief and hatred of his sin turn from it to God, with full purpose of, and endeavor after, future obediance."

Here the essence of repentance is represented as turning away from sin in order to lead a new life. This is accompanied with grief and hatred to sin, and is wrought in the heart by the grace of the Holy Spirit. The priest has nothing to do with the business; his interference would be a grand impertinence. Repentance prepares for the exercise of faith in Christ, whose blood alone cleanseth from all sin.

The first part of penance is contrition, which the Council of Trent not badly defines: "A sorrow and detestation of past sins, with a purpose of sinning no more." But when it goes on to say that "contrition blots out sin," it ascribes to the act of the sinner what

belongs alone to the Saviour. And when it says, "If the sinner have recourse to the tribunal of penance with a sincere sorrow for his sins, and a firm resolution of avoiding them in future, although he bring not with him that contrition which may be sufficient of itself to obtain the pardon of sin, his sins are forgiven by the minister of religion, through the power of the keys"—how unevangelical are such statements! Can a perfect contrition merit forgiveness? Will an imperfect contrition be accepted of God if complemented by the priest's absolution? This is the famous doctrine of attrition. Bishop Hay says:

A sorrow for sin which arises from fear of hell, etc., is called imperfect contrition and attrition. How do contrition and attrition differ in their effects? Perfect contrition, as it arises from a perfect love of God for himself alone, is so pleasing in his sight, that the moment a person has it, God is reconciled to him and

forgives his sins. Attrition, on the other hand, in no case attains of itself the remission of sin, but only disposes the soul for receiving that grace by means of the sacrament of penance.

Now, where in the Scriptures or in Christian experience did he learn that perfect contrition springs from the love of God and instantly procures pardon? How can any one have a sense of the love of God before his sins are forgiven? And what sort of a nondescript is this thing called *attrition*? It precisely suits this spurious sacrament. It is nowhere recognized in the Holy Scriptures. God indeed does not despise the first feeble motion of the sinner's heart to himself, under the drawings of the Holy Spirit; but before a man can believe with the heart unto righteousness, he must seek the Lord with his whole heart, which must be broken for sin and from sin—"renouncing every sin."

The second part of penance is confession.

By confession is here meant auricular confession, so called because it is whispered in the ear of the priest. Every Roman Catholic is bound to tell the priest, at least once a year, every sin, in deed, word, or thought that he can remember, "including secret offenses and those which have been committed against the last two precepts of the decalogue," upon pain of excommunication and damnation.

The *confiteor*, or form of confession, is as follows:

I confess to Almighty God, to blessed Mary, ever a virgin, to blessed

Michael the Archangel, to blessed John the Baptist, to the holy apostles Peter and Paul, to all the saints, and to thee, father, that I have sinned exceedingly, in thought, word, and deed, through my fault, through my most grievous fault: therefore, I beseech the blessed Mary, ever a virgin, the blessed Michael the Archangel, the blessed John the Baptist, the holy apostles Peter and Paul, all the saints, and thee, father, to pray to the Lord our God for me.

To assist the memory of penitents the priest is instructed to ask them questions on the several precepts of the decalogue. The questions which they are to ask of females at their confessional, as set down in their great text-books, Dens, Ligouri, and others, and in the manuals of devotion, such as the "Path of Paradise," which directs penitents how to examine themselves before confession, are simply abominable; they would disgrace a brothel. After such licentious language the penitent "touches with her lips either the ear or cheek of the spiritual father." Is it any wonder that it was necessary for Pope Paul IV. to issue a bull against *solicitants*, priests who *solicit* penitents to indecent

acts? Or that Gregory XV. should have found it necessary to issue another enjoining upon penitents to report all *solicitants*? Or that Benedict XIV. should issue another bull confirming the former bulls, and denouncing penitents who *solicit* confessors? At one time, in Seville, the number of females who reported solicitors was so great that twenty notaries and as many inquisitors were appointed to note down their reports, but they were so many that they gave up the matter, and it ended where it began.

It need scarcely be said that there is not the slightest authority in the Holy Scriptures for this shockingly demoralizing institution. Yet Romish polemics have the hardihood to say that it is set forth in the word of God, as well as in the writings of the Fathers and the decrees of Councils.

We once heard Dr. England, Bishop of Charleston, deliver a discourse on Auricular Confession in the cathedral in Baltimore, He said when in Ireland he was surprised to read in a list of dates of remarkable events, "Auricular Confession first introduced into the Church, A.D. 1215." He wondered how that could be, how the Church could have submitted to such an innovation without any controversy. He denied the statement, and went back, century by century, citing passages from Schoolmen and Fathers, which speak

of confession, till he got to the Apostles, when he raised himself to his full magnificent height, and hurled at us the language of St. James, “Confess your faults,” and that of St. John, “If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins.” (James v. 16; 1 John i. 9.) We listened to his very eloquent discourse—a masterpiece of sophistry, as well as of oratory—with amazement. It was impossible to consider him honest and sincere. He must have known that he was playing off the most barefaced sophistry upon his credulous and admiring hearers. He had read the entire passage which he garbled from James: “Confess your faults one to another, and pray one for another, that ye may be healed: the effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much.” He knew that there was no auricular confession dreamed of by the apostle; that there was no priest to confess to; that all that is meant is mutual confessions of Christians and mutual prayers. Each confesses to the other, and each prays for the other, as occasion may require. Ho must have known that the confession

spoken of in 1 John i. 9 was not auricular confession to a priest, to obtain his forgiveness, but direct confession to God, who is “faithful and just to forgive us our sins and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.” But the ingenious citation of passages from the Fathers and from the Scriptures, which speak of confession, without distinguishing between them and those of the decrees of the Councils of Lateran and Trent, secured his point. His ignorant and transported hearers never thought to inquire into the difference between the one and the other.

Thomas Maguire, the great champion of Romanism in Ireland, was equal to Bishop England in sophistry, if not in ingenuity and eloquence, and perhaps his superior in hardihood. Only think of a man’s adducing the case of Ananias and Sapphira as two penitents, forsooth, making “sacramental” confession to Peter in “the tribunal of penance.” Their *lying* to the apostle was singular auricular confession. It brought them a unique *absolution*: immediate death inflicted by the hand of God for their sins.

Of course Acts xix. 18, 19 is adduced as another proof of auricular confession: “And many that believed came, and confessed, and showed their deeds. Many of them also which used curious arts brought their books together, and burned them before all men; and they counted the price of them, and found it fifty thousand pieces of

silver." Here auricular confession is difficult to find. The whole transaction was as public as it could be. There was no whispering in anybody's ear; there was no priest there to receive the confession, no tribunal of penance, no absolution, for all took place after the *penitents* had believed and obtained pardon. They brought forth fruits meet for repentance, and this is required of every man.

The assertion that auricular confession was enjoined by the Fathers, as a part of the sacrament of penance, we utterly deny. They recommended, as we recommend, that penitents who need counsel in particular cases should repair to a minister or any other judicious person, to obtain it, and of course that they should confess their faults to any one whom they may have injured. But auricular confession was never made the law of the Church till the Lateran Council, A.D. 1215.

When Bishop England asks how such a revolting practice could be required on pain of excommunication, without exciting controversy, we answer, it was not. It was not introduced

without great opposition, aud some of the most eminent men in the Romish Communion have repudiated it.

Bingham, in the third chapter of the Eighteenth Book of his "Antiquities of the Christian Church," demonstrates the truth of this statement. He shows that the "fall confession" (ἐξομολόγησις) of the ancients was very different from auricular confession, and says that "the learned Albaspinaeus very strenuously sets himself to refute this error in the writers of his own party," and gives his language, which is full and explicit. Bingham also cites numerous passages from the Fathers, which show that "no necessity of auricular confession was ever urged by the ancient Church;" and concludes his demonstrative argument with a summary of the learned Daille's views on this subject.3

The third part of penance is satisfaction. This is the punishment prescribed by the priest, and voluntarily undergone by the penitent, to satisfy divine justice for sins committed after baptism. This, as we have seen, is set forth by the Council of Trent, as indispensable to pardon, and those who disallow it are anathematized by the Council. The punishments usually inflicted consist of "fasting, prayers, alms, or other works of piety." These other works consist of the repetition of Ave Marias and other formulas, pilgrimages, scourgings, and the like. The Council says that those punishments

procure, through the merits of Christ, the remission of the temporal punishment due to sin; they conform us to Christ in his sufferings, and powerfully tend to preserve and restrain penitents from sin.

Romish writers refer to Gen. iii.; Num. xii.; xx.; 2 Sam. xii. in support of their doctrine of satisfaction.

This dogma has been refuted in the exposition of the Ninth, Tenth, and Eleventh Articles: "Of the Justification of Man;" "Of Good Works," and "Of Works of Supererogation," and so need not be dwelt upon in this place.

The passages alluded to by the Tridentine doctors are all impertinent. The punishments inflicted upon Adam and Eve, Moses, Aaron, and Miriam, and David, and meekly borne by them, were not designed as compensations for their sins, but rather were penalties imposed upon them as warnings to others, and as patent evidences of the evil of sin, no matter by whom committed.

Popish satisfaction is very far from conforming any one to

Christ in his sufferings; it rather has a tendency to draw the mind away from the latter as the only meritorious ground of pardon and acceptance with God. The Scripture does not recognize the popish distinction between mortal sins and venial sins; the former deserving eternal punishment, to be remitted alone through the merits of Christ's satisfaction, and the latter deserving temporal punishment, to be remitted alone through the merit of penitential satisfaction. All sins deserve eternal death, and all are atoned for by the satisfaction of Christ, which is realized by justifying faith, not by works or sufferings of any sort.

If none of the duties prescribed by God can satisfy for sin, what shall be said of those puerile and painful penances which the priests prescribe, and to which their penitents submit? the endless repetition of prayers to God, the Virgin, and the saints; weary pilgrimages; painful scourgings; hair-cloth garments; revolting food; protracted fastings, etc., etc.? All such penances are an offense to both God and man, and it is a humiliation to say any thing concerning them.

Then it is shocking to a rectified conscience to speak of prayer, fasting, and alms-giving—duties prescribed by God—as penances or punishments for sin. What degraded conceptions must men have of God and his requirements! The reasonable service which he demands, though involving self-denial and bearing the cross, is to

be performed by us not as a penitentiary or purgatorial punishment to satisfy for sin, but as the obedience of loyal subjects and loving sons. His commandments are not grievous. The gratitude which springs from conscious pardon is that which impels us to obedience. The good works which he requires are such as are performed in accordance with his will, by the aid of his grace, and to his glory; and these comprehend no such ascetic services and sufferings as enter into this penitentiary system, "after the commandments and doctrines of men, which things indeed have a show of wisdom"—perhaps in this case Paul would rather say of folly—"in will-worship and humility, and neglecting of the body; not in any honor to the satisfying of the flesh." (Col. ii. 22, 23.)[4]

The Papists pretend that their doctrine of satisfaction was held

by the Fathers. We have elsewhere shown that the penitentiary system of the Fathers was very different from the sacramental penance prescribed by Rome, though it was not derived from the Scripture, and was fraught with mischief. And here we enter our protest against the opening paragraphs of the Commination Service of the Church of England, which reads thus:

> Brethren, in the primitive Church there was a godly discipline, that at the beginning of Lent such persons as stood convicted of notorious sin were put to open penance and punishment in this world, that their souls might he saved in the day of the Lord; and that others, admonished by their example, might be the more afraid to offend.
>
> Instead whereof (until the said discipline may be restored again, which is much to be wished) it is thought good that at this time (in the presence of you all) should be read the general sentences of God's cursing against impenitent sinners, gathered out of the seven and twentieth chapter of Deuteronomy, and other places of Scripture, etc.

No wonder that scornful Papists and "irreverent Dissenters" laugh at this. The Anglican Confession states that the Church has power to ordain rites and ceremonies. Why then does it not restore the patristic penitentiary system, if it wishes it so much? and so supersede this Ash-Wednesday penance prescribed for punishment in this world and salvation in the next. How different is all this from the salutary discipline enjoined in the New Testament!

The form of this pseudo-sacrament is nothing but the sentence of absolution pronounced by the priest, as already cited. The essential part of the form is *Te absolvo*, "I absolve thee." The forms

Absolvat te Christus, "May Christ absolve thee!" and *Absolvat te Deus*, "May God absolve thee!" are not considered valid by most Romanists. Dens says: "What is the sense of the sacramental form, *Ego te absolvo*? *Answer.* The sense is this: I judicially bestow on thee the grace of the remission of all thy sins, as far as is in the force of my ministry. This sense of the form, 'I declare thee absolved' cannot be admitted, because it is condemned by the Council of Trent, Ses. xiv., Can. 9."

Palmer, an Anglican divine, in his *Origines Liturgicae* says:

> The sacerdotal benediction of penitents was in the earliest times conveyed in the form of a prayer to God for their absolution; but, in after ages, different forms of benediction were used, both in the East and West. With regard to those varieties of form, it does not appear that they were formerly considered of any importance. A benediction seems to have been regarded as equally valid whether it was conveyed in the form of a petition or a declaration, whether in the optative

> or indicative mood, whether in the active or the passive voice, whether in the first second, or third person. It is true that a direct prayer to God is a most ancient form of blessing; but the use of a precatory or an optative form by no means warrants the inference that the person who uses it is devoid of any divinely instituted authority to bless and absolve in the congregation of God. Neither does the use of a direct indicative form of blessing or absolution imply any thing but the exercise of an authority which God has given, to such an extent, and under such limitations, as divine revelation has declared.

We have already shown what are these limitations according to Rome. The penitent looks to the priests, not for a declaration of pardon, "but, as the ministers of God, really to absolve from sin—a power which God himself, the author and source of grace and justification, exercises through their ministry." "In the minister of God, who sits in the tribunal of penance as his legitimate judge, he venerates the power and person of our Lord Jesus Christ; for in the administration of this, as in that of the other sacraments, the priest represents the character and discharges the functions of Jesus Christ." So says the Roman Catechism. No matter how vile a mortal he may be, if he sits in the tribunal of penance his sentence of absolution frees the penitent from his sins. This is a daring invasion of the prerogative of Him who alone hath power on earth to forgive sins. And yet for impiety and blasphemy like this Romanists plead Scripture warrant.

We have elsewhere shown that Matt. xvi. 19; xviii. 18; John xx. 21–23 are utterly irrelevant to the case in hand. They refer to the prerogative of the apostles to settle authoritatively what is or is not of binding obligation in the Church, the terms of pardon, and the laws of discipline. The apostles never arrogated the power to forgive the sins of any man, except in the sense of the remission of Church censures, as in 2 Cor. ii. 10: "To whom ye forgive any thing, I forgive also." This was the forgiveness of the incestuous Corinthian, who had been excommunicated from the Church, but in repentance was restored to its fellowship. (*Cf.* 1 Cor. v. 4, 5; 1 Tim. i. 20.)

If the terms "binding and loosing" are used of Church discipline as exercised by ordinary sinisters, they imply nothing more than excommunication on conviction of guilt, and restoration on the exhibition of repentance.

Bishop Jewell writes:

> We say that Christ hath given to his ministers power to bind, to loose, to open,
>
> 321
>
> to shut, and that the office of *loosing* consisteth in this: either (1) that the minister by the preaching of the gospel offereth the merits of Christ and full pardon to such as have lowly, contrite hearts and do unfeignedly repent themselves—pronouncing unto the same a sure and undoubted forgiveness of their sins, and hope of everlasting salvation: or else (2) that the same minister, when any have offended their brethren's minds with some great offense or notable or open crime, whereby they have, as it were, banished and made themselves strangers from the common fellowship, and from the body of Christ, then, after perfect amendment of such persons, doth reconcile them and bring them home again and *restore them* to the company and unity of the faithful. We say also the minister doth execute the authority of *binding and shutting*: (1) as often as he shutteth up the gate of the kingdom of heaven against unbelieving and stubborn persons, *denouncing* unto them God's vengeance and everlasting punishment; or else (2) when he doth shut them out from the bosom of the Church by open *excommunication*. Out of doubt, what sentence soever the minister of God shall give *in this sort*, God himself doth so well allow it, that whatsoever he looseth or bindeth here on earth, God himself will loose and bind and confirm the same in heaven.

As the penitentiary system of the Nicene Church is not scriptural nor expedient, we are not much concerned about it in this discussion; yet it may be well to state what Bingham says upon the

point. Bingham (Book xix., chap, i.) shows that

All Church absolution was only ministerial, not absolute. It consists in the due exercise and application of those means, in the ordinary use of which God is pleased to remit sins. These mysteries or means of grace, in the external dispensation of which the Church is concerned, and in the ordinary use of which remission of sins is conveyed, are usually by the ancients reckoned of under these five heads:

1. The absolution or great indulgence of baptism.
2. The absolution of the eucharist.
3. The absolution of the word and doctrine.
4. The absolution of imposition of hands and prayer.
5. The absolution of reconcilement to the Church and her communion by a relaxation of her censures.

The two first may be called sacramental absolution; the third, declaratory absolution; the fourth, precatory absolution; the fifth, judicial absolution; and all of them authoritative, so far as they are done by the ministerial authority and commission which Christ has given to his Church, to reconcile men to God by the exercise of such acts and means as conduce to that end in a subordinate and ministerial way, according to his appointment.

Bingham further shows that while "all the power of discipline was primarily lodged in the hands of the bishop," it was "in many cases committed to presbyters and to deacons also," as he proves by the language of the Council of Elibius and of Cyprian. He says: "In case of extreme necessity some canons allowed a layman to give baptism to a catechumen, which was reputed one sort of absolution, rather than he should die unbaptized." Bingham also points out (chap, ii.) that absolution was always given

before the altar or the reading desk in a supplicatory form, by imposition of hands and prayer:

The like forms of absolution by prayer are still in use in the Greek Church; and the old Ordo Romanus and some of the Roman Ceremonials and Pontificals show that the same form was used for many ages in the Latin Church also. If it be inquired when the use of the indicative form of absolution first began to be used in the Church—that is, the form, "I absolve thee," instead of the deprecatory form, "Christ absolve thee"—Morinus has fully proved that there was no use of it till the twelfth or thirteenth century, not long before the time of Thomas Aquinas, who was one of the first that wrote in defense of it,

Bingham afterward proceeds to show in what sense the indicative form may be allowed. But it is not necessary to discuss that matter, seeing that there are no priests in the Christian Church to cleanse spiritual lepers, or to pronounce them cleansed (as Rome pretends), but only ministers to declare the conditions of pardon and to help penitents in performing those conditions, or to excommunicate offenders from the Church on conviction of their crimes, and restore them on their repentance.

Bishop Burnet closes an elaborate, but not altogether satisfactory, discussion of this subject with this judicious paragraph:

The pardon that we give in the name of God is only declaratory of his pardon, or supplicatory in a prayer to him for pardon. In this we have the whole practice of the Church till the twelfth century universally of our side. All the fathers, all the ancient liturgies, all that have writ upon the offices, and the first schoolmen, are so express in this matter that the thing in fact can not be denied. Morinus has published so many of their old rituals that he has put an end to all doubting about it. In the twelfth century some few began to use the words, *I absolve thee*: yet, to soften this expression, that seemed new and bold, some tempered it with these words, *in so far as it is granted to my frailty*; and others with these words, *as far as the accusation comes from thee, and as the pardon is in me.* Yet this form was but little practiced: so that William, Bishop of Paris, speaks of the form of absolution as given only in a prayer, and not as given in these words, *I absolve thee.* He lived in the beginning of the fourteenth century: so that this practice, though begun in other places before this time, yet was not known long after in so public a city as Paris. But some schoolmen began to defend it, as implying only a declaration of the pardon pronounced by the priest; and this having an air of more authority, and being once justified by learned men, did so universally prevail that in little more than sixty years' time it became the universal practice of the whole Latin Church. So sure a thing is tradition, and so impossible to be changed, as they pretend, when within the compass of one age, the new form, *I absolve thee*, was not so much as generally known; and before the end of it the old form of doing it in a prayer, with imposition of hands, was quite worn out. The idea that naturally arises out of these words is that the priest pardons sins; and since that is subject to such abuses, and has let in so much corruption upon that Church, we think we have reason not only to deny that penance is a sacrament,

but likewise to affirm that they have corrupted this great and important doctrine of repentance, in all the parts and branches of it. Nor is the matter mended with that prayer that follows the absolution: "The passion of our Lord Jesus Christ, the merits of the blessed Virgin and all the saints, and all

the good that thou hast done, and the evil that thou hast suffered, be to thee for the remission of sins, the increase of grace, and the reward of eternal life."[5]

§ 7. Orders.

The next of "the commonly called sacraments," here repudiated as such, is called "Orders." This is one of the "states of life allowed in the Scriptures, but yet have not the like nature of Baptism and the Lord's-supper, because they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God."

The word "Orders," as used in the Romish Church, denotes "a sacrament by which a special grace is conferred on those ordained for the ministry." Webster says, "sacred ministry." But the word sacred, holy (*sacer*), is used by Papists to distinguish the Major Orders, subdeacon, deacon, and priest, from the Minor Orders, porter, reader, exorcist, acolyte, as they recognize seven orders in the ministry. Some make the Episcopate a distinct order, and so have eight; some add also the tonsure, and so have nine. Some add the singers also. The Greek Church has only four orders: presbyter, deacon, subdeacon, and reader.

In the order of priesthood, Romanists embrace the priest, bishop or pontiff, archbishop or metropolitan, patriarch, and pope.

As there are matter and form, administration and efficacy, in each of the seven ordinations, orders are manifestly not one sacrament, but seven sacraments, which, added to the other six, make thirteen sacraments in the Romish Church, or more than thirteen, according to the number of orders recognized.

The Roman Catechism says: "Tonsure is a sort of preparation for receiving orders. In tonsure the hair of the head is cut in form of a crown, and should be worn in that form, enlarging the crown according as the ecclesiastic advances in orders." The catechism goes on to say that Peter introduced it, and that it represents the crown of thorns, royal dignity, the perfection of the ecclesiastical state, and the like nonsense.

The porter is consecrated by the bishop's handing him the keys of the church, saying, "Conduct yourself as having to render

an account to God for those things which are kept under these

keys;" the reader, by the bishop's handing him a book containing the duties of his position, saying, "Receive (this book), and be you a rehearser of the word of God, destined, if you approve yourself faithful and useful in the discharge of your office, to have a part with those who from the beginning have acquitted themselves well in the ministry of the divine word." The bishop, when initiating the exorcist, hands him a book containing the exorcisms, saying, "Take this and commit it to memory, and have power to impose hands on persons possessed, be they baptized or catechumens." At the "ordination" of the acolyte, the bishop places in his hands a light, saying, "Receive this waxlight, and know that henceforth you are devoted to light the church in the name of the Lord." He also hands him empty cruets, saying, "Receive these cruets, which are to supply wine and water for the eucharist of the blood of Christ, in the name of the Lord."

In the consecration of subdeacons, the bishop first admonishes each of the candidates that by his ordination he assumes the solemn obligation of perpetual continence, then gives him a chalice and a consecrated patena, and the archdeacon gives him cruets filled with wine and water, and a basin and towel, when the bishop says: "See what ministry is confided to you; I admonish you, therefore, to so comport yourself as to be pleasing in the sight of God." He puts on him his vestments, saying certain words and making use of certain ceremonies, and then gives him the Book of the Epistles, saying, "Receive the Book of the Epistles, and have power to read them in the Church of God, both for the living and the dead."

In ordaining a deacon the bishop puts on him a stole, lays hands on him, gives him the Book of the Gospels, saying, "Receive power to read the Gospel in the Church of God, as well for the living as for the dead, in the name of the Lord."

The Catechism says:

> The third and highest degree of all holy orders is the priesthood. The bishop, and after him the priests who may he present, impose hands on the candidate for priesthood; then, placing a stole on his shoulders, he anoints it in form of a cross. He next anoints his hands with sacred oil, reaches him a chalice containing wine, and a patena with bread, saying, "Receive power to offer sacrifice to God, and to celebrate mass as well for the living as the dead."

By these words and ceremonies he is constituted an interpreter

and mediator between God and man, this being the principal function of the priesthood. Finally, placing his hands on the head of the persons to be ordained, the bishop says:

"Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them; and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained;" thus investing him with that divine power of forgiving and retaining sins, which was conferred by our Lord on his disciples. These are the principal and peculiar functions of the priesthood.

If the foregoing are not *seven sacraments* they are certainly not *one sacrament* since there are matter, form, administrator, and assumed efficacy in each.

The Catechism furthermore says: "The sacrament of orders is not to be conferred on very young or on insane persons, because they do not enjoy the use of reason; if administered, however, it no doubt impresses a character."

Aquinas says:

In consequence of the death of Jesus the sacraments instituted in the New Testament have obtained what is called *virtus instrumentalis*, or *effectiva*, which those of the Old Testament did not possess. Therefore, by partaking of the sacraments, man acquires a certain character which, in the case of some sacraments, such as baptism, confirmation, and the ordination of priests, is *character indelibilis*, and consequently renders impossible the repetition of such sacraments.

The Council of Florence says:

Among the sacraments there are three, baptism, confirmation, and orders, which imprint in the soul a character, that is, a certain spiritual and indelible sign, distinguishing it from others. Hence, in the same person these sacraments are not repeated. The other four do not imprint a character, and admit of repetition.

The Council of Trent says:

Whoever shall affirm that a character, that is, a certain spiritual and indelible mark, is not impressed on the soul by the three sacraments of baptism, confirmation, and orders, for which reason they can not be repeated: let him be accursed.

In what this mysterious *character* consists we can not imagine, and Romanists are not agreed among themselves, as they have a great diversity of opinions concerning it. Thomas Aquinas restricts it in orders to "the ordination of priests." Hence, once a priest, always a priest. He may be stripped of his function, but not of his *character*. Bailly, a celebrated Papist polemic, says:

It is certain that the character impressed in ordination remains in the wicked—simoniacs, degraded persons, also in those who, after ordination, fall into heresy

or schism, because character is indelible. Ordinations conferred according to the rite instituted by Christ are valid, though performed by bishops who are heretics, schismatics, degraded, deposed, excommunicated, intruded, invaders, simoniacs, in one word, by any wicked person.

This indelible character, according to Romanists is something different from sanctifying grace and sacramental grace, which they say are both conferred in ordination. Thus the Catechism says: "The sacrament of orders imparts grace to him who receives it with proper dispositions, which qualifies and enables him to discharge with fidelity the duties which it imposes." The Council of Trent says, "If any one shall say that by sacred ordination the Holy Ghost is not given, and that the bishop says in vain, 'Receive the Holy Ghost,' let him be anathema."

But it is useless to dwell longer upon this pseudo-sacrament, in order to show what is claimed for it by the Church of Rome.

In opposition to this boasted sacrament of orders, we allege as follows:

1. The Scriptures are utterly silent as to any of these orders, except those of deacon and presbyter, or bishop, that is, pastor and teacher.

In Acts vi. we read of seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom, who were chosen by the multitude of the disciples in the Church at Jerusalem to dispense the charities of the Church, and because the word *διακονία* (ministration) is used, they are commonly called "deacons." They were set apart to their work by prayer and the laying on of the apostles' hands. In 1 Tim. iii. we find a description of certain officers called "deacons," who seem to have other duties assigned them besides the serving of tables. So in Phil. i. 1, we read of the "bishops and deacons," and that is all that is said about them in the Scriptures. They are not elsewhere mentioned in the sacred volume.

In Acts xi. 30; xiv. 23; xv. 4, 6, 23; xvi. 4; xx. 17; 1 Tim. v. 1, 17, 19; Titus i. 5; James v. 14; 1 Pet. v. 1 we read of certain officers of the Church called "elders," presbyters, a title of dignity, because they were usually men of age and honorable position. When Paul and Barnabas were on their great tour "they ordained them elders

in every Church" (Acts xiv. 23); but with what ceremony is not stated; the χειροτονήσαντες, means simply to appoint or constitute. Some, in view of the etymology

of the word, think it was done by suffrage, stretching out the hands of the people, not the laying on of the hands of the apostles; but whatever was done was done by the apostles. For the word, compare Acts x. 41: "Chosen before of God," where there was neither stretching out the hands nor laying them on.

Titus, an evangelist, was instructed by Paul to "ordain elders in every city" in Crete; and these elders are called bishops, like those in Ephesus, Acts xx. 17, 28, where the word rendered "overseers" is bishops. Timothy, another evangelist, received similar instructions to ordain bishops in Ephesus. From 1 Tim. v. 22 it is inferred that he did it with the imposition of hands, though that is a disputed point.

It is observable that apostles sometimes called themselves "elders," but never "bishops," the latter title being restricted to the pastorate, which was incompatible with the apostolate. (1 Pet. v. 1; 2 John 1; 3 John 1.)

In Rom. xii. G-8 there is an enumeration of offices, prophecy, ministry, teaching, exhorting, giving, ruling, showing mercy. In 1 Cor. xii. 28–30 we read that "God hath set some in the Church, first apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, government, diversities of tongues. Are all apostles? Are all prophets? Are all teachers? Are all workers of miracles? Have all the gifts of healing? Do all speak with tongues? Do all interpret?" We presume very few in orders in the Romish Church do any of these things except *teaching*, and few of them do much of that.

In Eph. iv. 11, 12 we read: "He gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ." All the officers here mentioned are extraordinary and temporary, except pastors and teachers, who are the elders of the Church, the bishops, or shepherds, of the flock. "The angel of the Church," mentioned Rev. i.–iii. was probably the president of the "presbytery," as the body of elders in a city is called in 1 Tim. iv. 14, where Paul says to Timothy, who was an "evangelist," "Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given

thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery." In 2 Tim. i. 6, Paul says to him: "I put thee in remembrance, that thou stir up the gift of God, which is in thee, by the putting on

of my hands." It is likely the elders of some Church joined with the apostle in the imposition of hands when Timothy was set apart to do the work of an evangelist. So "certain prophets and teachers," in the Church at Antioch laid their hands on Paul and Barnabas when they were sent forth by the Spirit on their great missionary tour, though both of them had been long in the ministry, and one of them was an apostle.

There are no other "orders" mentioned in the New Testament, where we read of no tonsure, porter, reader, exorcist, acolyte, or subdeacon. Several of these functionaries may do well enough: some must open the church, light, warm, and clean it, take care of the sacred vessels, assist in divine worship, etc.; but it is as ridiculous to speak of them as in sacramental orders as it would be for us to speak thus of our Sunday-school teachers, class-leaders, exhorters, licensed preachers, stewards, trustees, and sextons.

2. We read nothing in the Scriptures of ordination by a bishop, but only by apostles, evangelists, and presbyters. Apostles and evangelists were extraordinary, temporary officers. Presbyters are the stated, ordinary rulers and pastors of the Church. (1 Tim. v. 17; Heb. xiii. 7, 17, 24.) They are nowhere commanded to ordain men to the ministry; but, as representatives of the Church and ministers of Christ, it seems proper that they should do so. If they see proper to appoint one or more of their number to do this work for them, there is certainly nothing in the Scripture or in the nature of the case forbidding it. If they choose to call the presiding elder, to whom this and other functions are committed, *the bishop*, by eminence, "the angel of the Church," there can be no reasonable objection to it. That this took place in the post-apostolic Church, is a matter of history. But to argue from this, that none but a bishop has the power to confer orders is simply preposterous.

3. There is not a word in the Scriptures about the matter and form of any of these seven sacraments of ordination—not a word, except of the imposition of hands. Nor is this mentioned in the case of the ordination of Matthias and Paul, who filled the places of Judas and James in the sacred college. Imposition of hands was

common among the Jews and primitive Christians, being a simple and significant rite, designating the person upon whom a blessing is pronounced, a miracle performed,

or an office conferred. There was no virtue in it whatever. It is nowhere prescribed as necessary in ordination, though it sometimes took place as we have seen. As to the presentation of sacred vessels, books, tapers, and the like, with the pronunciation of certain formulas, there is not a syllable about all this in the New Testament or the early Fathers; and yet, without these things, as the form and matter of the sacrament of orders, Romanists hold there is no such sacrament; but their argument proves too much: no sacrament of this character is described in the New Testament.

4. There is not a word in the Scriptures about the sacramental grace or the indelibility of orders. The passages cited (1 Tim. iv. 14; 2 Tim. i. 6) obviously refer to a supernatural, miraculous gift, *charism*, imparted to Timothy, to qualify him for the extraordinary work of an evangelist. It was imparted by the laying on of the apostle's hands (just as the Holy Ghost was given for other though similar ends to the believers mentioned Acts viii.; xix.), with the concurrence of the prophets and other members of the presbytery. A fire was then enkindled in his breast, and the apostle exhorted him to stir it up, to keep it burning by constant exercise, and to quench not the Spirit imparted to him to qualify him for his evangelical office. But what has this to do with sacramental grace? Where was ever a Romish priest thus endowed by the laying on of the hands of prelate or pope? What grace of any sort was ever conveyed by the mummeries of a Romish ordination? And where does the Scripture speak of an indelible character imprinted in ordination? Judas was an apostle, but he became an apostate. Was the apostolic character indelible in him? Peter answers when he prayed the Lord to show whom he had chosen to "take part of this ministry and apostleship, from which Judas by transgression fell." When he fell from grace he fell from his apostleship. If any sacramental character had been impressed upon him, it was forever erased. He fell, and went to his own place, and we know what place is proper to apostates, whether priests or laity. (Acts i.)

5. True ministers are holy men called of God, recognized by the Church, set apart by some decent, edifying ceremony, that they might be known of all men to be clothed with the sacred functions.

330
As ministers represent Christ and the Church, their acts are valid, though they themselves may be hypocrites. They may be useful, but it can hardly be thought that they can be as useful as if they were what they profess to be. When proved to be wicked men, they should be deposed without delay; they are no more ministers of Christ and his Church than if they never had been ordained.

Any method not superstitious, or otherwise unscriptural, may be adopted to constitute ministers.

It may be done by immediate ordination over a particular Church.

It may be done by a more gradual process, by licensing them to exhort, to preach, to officiate as deacons, and then as presbyters.

It may be done by a general consecration to the work of the ministry, either by a vote of the Church, or by the laying on of the hands of the presbytery, or by the laying on of the hands of one set apart for the purpose, called “bishop” by distinction.

Any of these methods may be lawfully adopted, and they are all in use, as there is no law or well-defined precedent in the premises contained in the Holy Scriptures.

The Nicene Church had many ecclesiastical offices, numerous rites and ceremonies; but it knew nothing of the “sacrament of orders,” though gradually hierarchical views developed to an unscriptural extent, and prepared the way for the elevation of orders into the dignity of a sacrament.

Bingham, in the Second Book of “Christian Antiquities,” treats at large of the several superior orders of the clergy, in the primitive Church; and in the Third Book, “of the inferior orders.” All the latter he shows to have been not of apostolical, but of ecclesiastical institution, against Baronius and the Council of Trent. He shows that there was no certain number of them, but specifies subdeacons, acolythists, exorcists, lectors, ostiarii, psalmistae, copeatae, parebolani, catechists, defensores, oeconomi, and other inferior officers. In the Fifth Book he speaks “of the elections and ordinations of the clergy, and the particular qualifications of such as were to be ordained.” But with these matters we are not concerned. The rules which they adopted may be studied perhaps with some profit, but many of

331
them are inapplicable to our case, and none of them are of any

binding force.

[In connection with the foregoing anti-fanatical, common-sense, and scriptural views of Dr. Summers may be considered the position taken and defended by Professor Raymond, of the Garrett Biblical Institute, of the Methodist Episcopal Church:

God has signified in his word that it is his will that certain men, whom he calls, shall devote themselves to the service of his Church; and that the Church shall recognize persons giving evidence of such a divine call as its ministers; shall appoint them to the ministry, authorize them to discharge the functions of the ministerial office, shall co-operate with them in their work, and contribute to their temporal support. But as to the mode of their election, the forms and ceremonies of their ordination, the persons or officers by whom they shall be ordained, the division of their labors, and the ranks, classes, or orders into which they themselves shall be divided, the New Testament gives no distinct directions, and therefore as to these things there are no divine requirements; but the Church is left to determine them at its discretion: provided, always, that in its action it does not contravene any plainly revealed principle of Church government. Now, if to one holding this theory the question, How many orders are there in the Christian ministry? be asked, and the term orders be accepted in the sense of High-churchism, the only answer he can give, consistent with his own theory, is that there are no orders at all; there is no divine requirement for any classification whatever; all Christian ministers, so far as divine right is concerned, are co-ordinate. . . . But it will be said that the word orders, as used by Protestants, generally has another signification; namely, a distinction of classes in the ministry by the conventional decisions of the Church. In this sense, the only answer most Protestants can give, consistent with their theory, to the question, How many orders are there? is, just as many as the Church pleases to make. . . . It is not very uncommon, in the parlance of the Methodist Episcopal Church, to say that there are two orders in the ministry. Let us examine this a little and see how it looks. We have nominally three classes—bishops, elders, and deacons. In theory it is affirmed that bishops and elders are of the same order; so that we have two orders—presbyters and deacons. Now we do not claim that the two are by divine right, for we have always recognized the English Wesleyan Church as a true and valid Christian and Methodist Church, and they have no deacons and but one ordination for their elders.[6] The distinction then is with us, by conventional decision. On what is this distinction founded? Our bishops are differentiated from our elders by at least three very important prerogatives, and our elders differ from our deacons by only one prerogative, and that a very unimportant one. Necessities excepted, the right of ordination, the power to station traveling ministers, and the presidency of the General Conference, are exclusive prerogatives of the bishops; but the only prerogative possessed by an elder not possessed by a

deacon is the right to read the consecrating prayer over the elements in the sacrament of

the Lord's-supper. Now, to call the distinction between a bishop and an elder a distinction of office, and that between an elder and a deacon one of *order*, and at the same time to attach any sacredness or important elevation in degree to the idea of an order, not belonging to an office, is, to say the least of it, a strange misnomer. If the word order means a class of ministers ordained by the imposition of hands, then, of course, all will agree that we have three orders.[7]

Dr. Whedon, than whom there has hardly been a more incisive thinker or weightier authority in Episcopal Methodism, thus expresses himself on this question:

It is held by many in our Church that the eldership and deaconship are orders, while the bishopric is only an office. And we have not long since seen it stated, even in some of our official papers, that we are in fact Presbyterians. The ablest of American Methodist theologians, however, Dr. Wilbur Fisk, entirely repudiated that view. Such a position involves us in the most inextricable contradictions. Are not our bishops consecrated by the most solemn of the three ordinations? How can there be an *ordination* if not to an *order*? In the form of bestowing the three trusts, professedly under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, is there any intimation that one is less an order than the other? Surely we are not after all the Methodist Presbyterian Church, or the Methodist Congregational Church, but, if we mistake not, we are truly the Methodist *Episcopal* Church.[8]

Under the caption, "The Significance of Orders," Dr. Whedon continues:

In regard to the proper nature of "orders," we have asked, "How can there be an ordination if not to an order?" This question embraces an entire argument. The old verbs to *ordain* and to *order* were different forms of the same word, used in the ritual of the Anglican Church, of which Wesley was a presbyter. To *order* signifies to endow with orders, just as to magnetize signifies to endow with magnetism. And so Webster rightly defines "ordination, in the Episcopal Church the act of conferring holy *orders* or sacerdotal power, called also consecration." And so the old Thirty-sixth Article of the Anglican Church says, "The Book of Consecration . . . doth contain all things necessary to such consecration or *ordering*. And, therefore, whosoever are consecrated or *ordered*, according to the rites of that book. . . . we decree all such to be rightly . . . consecrated or *ordered*." The word had this import because to the mind of the Church the thing had this nature. *Ordination* was the mode and test of an *order*. As an Anglican Churchman Mr. Wesley's mind was shaped to the assumption that a valid

ordination always conferred valid orders. Although the word *order* is an ecclesiastical rather than a scriptural term, and is of very flexible import, yet the best definition we can give it would be thus: Order is a rank of ministry constituted by election and ordination, permanently and successionally continued in a Church. Our episcopate would thus be an order.[9]

333

Dr. Whedon's conclusions may be summarized in the following quotations:

He [Mr. Wesley] was the founder, the spiritual archbishop, the epochal man at the epochal period, by whom the ordination was conferred. That ordination he held to confer the right of ordaining men empowered thereby to administer the sacraments. The office conferred on Coke had all the attributes we can ascribe to an order; namely, ordination, exclusive right to ordain, life-tenure, and successional permanence in the future. . . . He did believe that his was the providential endowment to ordain a bishop for America according to the practice of the primitive Church. And when the proper ordination of bishop was performed Coke was as true a bishop as if he had been ordained by the Archbishop of Canterbury. . . . Whenever, under the approbation of the great Head of the Church, the foundations of a new Church are laid, and its structure reared, ordination is the divinely sanctioned mode of authorization for the ministry of the word and sacraments. And though a Church may shape itself into such forms as is providentially best adapted to effect its true purposes, and though other forms of Church government are doubtless permissible, yet we believe episcopacy to be apostolically sanctioned, though not enjoined, and primarily the best form of government for the most efficient evangelical action.[10]

On three grounds, then, Mr. Wesley was "a spiritual archbishop." *First*, he was a presbyter of the Church, a rank in which the primordial power inheres of conferring orders. *Second*, this presbyterial rank would not constitute a right to ordain without a divine providential *call*, and that call actually existing was the second ground. *Third*, a people, also called providentially, with a great future before it, needed, waited for, and was ready to accept, this ordination and its threefold orders as the fundamental form of its Church. And thus by this conjoint action and composite act of founder, ministry, and people, we repeat, in the face of all the reclamations which our affirmation has encountered, there was created as true an episcopacy as has ever existed in the Christian Church.[11]

Our Methodist Episcopacy, formed and maintained by the free-will of the Church, is the most legitimate episcopacy extant in Christendom. It is co-existent with our existence as a Church, a bishop being the earliest officer, chronologically, of our churchly organization. Our episcopacy is

based upon our very foundations as a Church. None of its essential attributes can be rightfully changed but by a constitutional change. Thus firmly founded, *our great blessing is that it sets up, and can set up, no* jure divino *claims.* Our Episcopalian friends have an ineradicable notion that we Methodists feel the aching want of something which we have not and they have, namely, a *jure divino* ordained line of bishops. But from that nightmare, our prayer is, "Good Lord, deliver us." Our episcopacy will stand no longer than the Church is convinced of its value. The great success of our history is thus far its ample vindication.[12]

These Methodist citations may well conclude with an historical survey of the development of episcopacy, particularly in its diocesan form, in the primitive Church. The facts have seldom

been more clearly and succinctly stated than in the following epitome of Professor Raymond's:

Episcopacy was a natural growth from, or a development of, the state of things inaugurated by the apostles. As may be naturally expected, no important change occurred during the first century. In the extant writings of those times all allusions to the matter of Church polity conform substantially to similar allusions in the New Testament. Clement of Rome, who wrote about A.D. 95; Polycarp, a disciple of John, who wrote about A.D. 140; and Justin Martyr, a contemporary of Polycarp—all address ministers as presbyters and deacons, or bishops and deacons, in the same way that they are addressed in the Epistles of Paul, indicating clearly that up to and during their times the chief ministers of the Church belonged to one or the other of two, and only two, classes. In the writings of Ignatius, A.D. 116, a distinction between bishops and presbyters first makes its appearance. It is said by some that these so-called Epistles of Ignatius are forgeries, and by others that they are interpolated copies of original epistles. But even if these Epistles of Ignatius are discounted as unworthy of confidence, the subsequent histories make it evident that early in the second century changes in the externals of the Church began to appear, and that episcopacy had its beginnings among the earliest developments of post-apostolic times. To our thought a careful consideration of the facts of the case will make it appear that an episcopal form of Church government was the result of a natural growth from the apostolic germ; was the natural, if not the necessary, result of development. The Church, as it was in the time of Polycarp and Ignatius, could not remain stationary; it must either dwindle and become extinct, or it must prosper, develop its powers, and extend its dimensions. . . . Nothing short of a divine prohibition expressed in positive terms, either by Christ himself or his inspired apostles, could prevent some variations in the institutions of the Church from the forms left by its founders. No well-defined system of Church polity was instituted;

no directions were left to guide the Church in its future action. The Church for the time being took on such forms as circumstances required, and it was left to its own discretion in determining what forms its future exigencies might demand. The great Head of the Church foresaw what would be, and did not interpose any prohibitory interdicts to prevent it, or any precautionary prophecies to forewarn the Church against it. Episcopacy did actually arise, and for at least twelve hundred years was, without opposition, the only existing form of Church government throughout the Christian world. It has always been, and is now, the form adopted by a very large majority of the Churches naming the name of Christ.

For the details of the rise and progress of episcopacy, the reader must be referred to the ecclesiastical histories. Our purpose does not require us to refer to them. The authorities, so far as they are reliable, give precisely the same account of the rise of this system, as to its essential characteristics, that ore would naturally suppose it to be, forming his judgment from the facts, statements, and references recorded in the New Testament. With the Acts and Epistles as our guide and the basis of our judgment, we think of the Christian Church during the first seventy years of its history as consisting of assemblies of believers in Christ, united together by a form of association as simple as can well be conceived. Their meetings are held in the synagogues of the Jews wherever they

have liberty to use them; or in seminaries of learning, as in the school of Tyrannus; or in private dwellings, as in the house of Stephanas—or, in a word, in any obtainable place most convenient. When assembled they were seated, whenever practicable, after the manner of the synagogue, the elders sitting in a semicircle facing the people.

The elders, where their organization was complete, were ten in number; sometimes less, never more, it is said, in a single congregation. Of these one, corresponding to the ruler of the synagogue, was *the* elder, presbyter, bishop, pastor, perhaps, as in Revelation, the angel of the Church: two others were assistant pastors, the three corresponding to what are called the “rulers of the synagogue.” The ten constituted the presbytery of the Church, or its official board. It is probable that the three rulers were ordained ministers, the assistant pastors being as such authorized, in the absence of *the* pastor, to administer the sacraments. The other seven elders might be ministers or laymen; probably most or all of them were laymen, elevated to this honor, as were “the elders of the people” in the synagogues of the Jews, for their wisdom, their gravity, or their age.

The services consisted, first, of the reading of the Scriptures by one of the elders, probably one of the assistant pastors, to whom that duty was specially assigned; after which the pastor expounded the lesson read, and made an exhortation to the people. This service, however, was not restricted; the pastor might give liberty to any one in the congregation to

address the people. At least this is probable, since it not unfrequently occurred in the synagogue. [See Acts xiii. 15, 16.] The sermon or exhortation ended, the pastor offered prayer, and the people responded Amen. This done, the sacrament of the Lord's-supper was administered, after which the service was closed. . . .

In the infancy of the Churches it is probable that all the official members rendered their services without any financial remuneration; but it is evident that in all cases where the people were able to contribute an adequate support for their pastor they were required to do so, and the pastors were required to give themselves wholly to the word of God and prayer. This is evident from the frequent exhortations given in the Epistles on this subject; they "that were taught in the word" were required "to communicale unto him that teacheth in all good things." The leading Church enterprise of the times was the dissemination of the word, and in this work all shared as they had opportunity. When scattered abroad by persecution they went everywhere preaching the word, as was the case when Saul made havoc of the Church after the martyrdom of Stephen. And when the Church had rest and was prospered missionaries were sent forth with letters of commendation, as in the case of Paul and Barnabas sent from the Church at Antioch. This work of evangelization must have occupied the entire attention of the Church and employed all its resources during the years of the first century. There was neither occasion nor opportunity for devising Church polities for the administration of the affairs of established and prosperous Churches. This work began when the condition of the Church required it, which state of things began to appear early in the second century.

From the first the pastors administered some form of government. They presided over the presbytery. The pastor was the angel of the Church, the man in whom centered the chief authority. When there were several churches in the same city the presbyters of all the churches assembled together for consultation

concerning the general interests of the cause in the city where they dwelt, and for co-operation in spreading the gospel in the regions beyond. In these assemblies some one must preside. As is usual in such cases, the one appointed to this honor would be the pastor of the most prominent Church, or the man most distinguished and most deserving of such honor. Soon, when the general interests of the Church in such a city required the entire attention of some one, the president of the metropolitan presbytery would very naturally be called to such an office, and thus become another and a higher officer than had previously existed. In the nature of the case such a one would exercise some sort of supervision over all the Churches, over all the ministers and members of all the Churches included in the jurisdiction of the presbytery in which his office originated; he became the angel of the

whole Church in that city and its suburbs. Soon he was distinguished from other presbyters by such titles as would indicate his office, and the word *episcopos*, bishop [superintendent, overseer], was seized upon and used for this purpose. It had previously been indiscriminately applied to all presbyters, but from this point onward it began to be used exclusively to designate not a "*pastor gregis*" merely, but a "*pastor gregis et pastorum*"—it was the title of him that exercised the general oversight; who was an overseer of the Churches both as to the ministry and the membership. This is the origin of [diocesan] episcopacy. For the details of its progress from this humble, natural, and praiseworthy commencement to its terrible corruption and prostitution, as seen in the assumptions of the Eastern patriarchs and Western popes, we must look to the ecclesiastical histories. It is sufficient here to say that bishops of cities became bishops of provinces, of states, and of empires; became archbishops, patriarchs, and popes, and became thus by the same processes by which power is usually centralized [imitating closely, however, the organic forms of administration in the imperial government], and by which ambitious men make for themselves high places and occupy them.13]

§ 8. Matrimony.

The next pseudo-sacrament repudiated in this article is Matrimony. This is a state of life allowed in the Scriptures, but yet has not the like nature of Baptism and the Lord's-supper, because it has not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God.

This opposes the teaching of the Romish Church, as set forth in the canons of the Council of Trent. In its twenty-fourth session the Council issued twelve canons and curses on the subject of matrimony. We have to do only with the first: "Whoever shall affirm that matrimony is not truly and properly one of the Seven Sacraments of the evangelical law, instituted by Christ our Lord, but that it is a human invention, introduced into the Church, and does not confer grace: let him be accursed."

The Roman Catechism says:

> That marriage is a sacrament has been at all times held by the Church as a certain and well-ascertained truth; and in this she is supported by the authority

> of the Apostle in his Epistle to the Ephesians: "Husbands should love their wives, as their own bodies; he who loveth his wife, loveth himself; for no one ever hated his own flesh, but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as

Christ doth the Church; for we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones. For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and cleave to his wife, and they shall be two in one flesh. This is a great sacrament, but I speak in Christ and in the Church." When the Apostle says, this is a great sacrament, he means, no doubt, to designate marriage; as if he had said, the conjugal union between man and wife, of which God is the author, is a sacrament; that is, a sacred sign of the holy union that subsists between Christ and his Church. That this is the true meaning of his words is shown by the holy Fathers who have interpreted the passage; and the Council of Trent has given to it the same interpretation. . . . That this sacrament signifies and confers grace, and in this the nature of a sacrament principally consists, we learn from these words of the Council of Trent: "The grace which perfects that natural love, and confirms that indissoluble union, Christ himself, the author and finisher of the sacraments, has merited for us by his passion."

The *matter* of this sacrament, the Roman doctors say, is the inward consent of the parties; and the *form*, the word or signs by which this is expressed. The administrator is the priest. Let us consider the number of errors manifest here.

1. Matrimony was not instituted by Christ. It "is an honorable estate instituted of God in the time of man's innocency." The Papists say it was not then a sacrament, nor was it a sacrament under the law, but Christ raised it to that rank, but they furnish no proof. Some of them say he did it by going to the marriage in Cana; others, when he said, "What God hath joined together, let not man put asunder" (Matt. xix. 6); and others, during the forty days after his resurrection—a convenient time that, as no one can prove that he did not do it then.
2. The Scripture nowhere intimates any outward and visible sign in matrimony to make it a sacrament. *Inward consent* is not an outward and visible sign.
3. The Scriptures nowhere say any thing about the form of matrimony. What words are prescribed by Christ?
4. The Scriptures say nothing about any *priestly administrator*; they say nothing about any administrator of marriage.
5. The Scriptures say nothing about any *sacramental effect* in matrimony. Doubtless marriage, like every thing else lawful, may be made a means of grace; but that is a different matter. Where do the Scriptures say that matrimony, as a sacrament,

"confers grace?" Nowhere; and any one may know that there is no passage to the point when the Roman doctors refer to

338

1 Tim. ii. 15: "She shall be saved in child-bearing, if they continue in faith and love."

6. The Church has not always held that matrimony is a sacrament ordained by Christ, like Baptism and the Lord's-supper. We admit that the Fathers sometimes call matrimony a sacrament, but then, as we have shown in other cases, they use the word in a general and loose sense, not as we define it. The jugglery in the use of this word is transparent. The Vulgate renders Eph. v. 32: "*Sacramentum hoc magnum est, ego autem dico in Christo, et in Ecclesia.*" But everybody knows, or ought to know, that μυστήριον does not mean a sacrament, nor is the word *sacramentum* used in the Vulgate, in the sense of our word sacrament. In this passage our old translators render, "This is a great secret." Wycliffe and Rheims, rendering from the Vulgate, have "sacrament." Tertullian says that Adam's calling Eve "bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh" was a great sacrament concerning Christ and his Church. Chrysostom says:

That it is something great and wonderful, Moses, or rather God, intimated. For the present, however, saith he, I speak concerning Christ, both that he left the Father and came down, came to the bride, and became one Spirit. For he that is joined unto the Lord is one Spirit. And he says well. It is a great mystery. And then as though he were to say, Nevertheless the allegory does not destroy affection, he adds, Let every one of you in particular so love his wife, even as himself.

So we say in "The Form of the Solemnization of Matrimony," it "signifies unto us the mystical union that is between Christ and his Church."

The word μυστήριον means here, as frequently in the New Testament and in this Epistle (*e. g.*, i. 9; iii, 4, 9; vi. 19), a great truth, long secret, but now revealed, as in Rom. xvi. 25, where the same writer speaks of the gospel preached to the Gentiles as "the revelation of the mystery which was kept secret since the world began."[14] Μυστήριον occurs twenty-seven times in the

339

New Testament, and our translators have Anglicized it in every

instance. In the passage under discussion it is not clear that Paul speaks of marriage as a mystery, though he runs a kind of allegory between that and the mystical union between Christ and his Church, because he says: “But I speak with reference to Christ and with reference to the Church,” meaning it would seem, says Bloomfield:

> But in saying this I especially advert to the union between Christ and his Church, that you may apply it to yourselves. Dr. Chandler remarks, after Calvin, that the Papists would fain prove from this passage that marriage is a sacrament, whereas μυστήριον in the New Testament is never a sacrament. It would have been more correct to say “some Papists,” for I do not find all Papists of this opinion; certainly Thomas Aquinas and De Lyra were not. Cardinal Cajetan and Estius both admit that the doctrine cannot be proved from this passage; and they remark (what ought to have no little weight) that neither did the ancient Catholic divines adduce it in proof. Indeed, Estius adopts the sense assigned by the best Protestant commentators.

So falls this pseudo-sacrament, and with it all the superstition ingrafted on it, especially the Romish dogma that the *vinculum* of matrimony cannot be dissolved by conjugal infidelity. It is not true that the Fathers unanimously held this dogma. Bingham, in his sixteenth book, chap, xi., sec. 6, discusses this question, and concludes thus:

> From all which we may easily perceive that this was always reckoned a difficult question, Whether persons, after a lawful divorce, might marry again in the life-time of the relinquished party? The imperial laws allowed it; many of the ancient Fathers opposed it; some condemned it, but suffered it to pass without any public punishment; and others required a certain penance to be done for it in the Church. Of all which different practices the learned reader that is more curious may find an ample account in Cotelerius’s “Notes upon Hermas, Pastor.” But though they differed upon this point, there was no disagreement upon the other: that to marry a second wife after an unlawful divorce, while the former was living, was professed adultery, and as such to be punished by the sharpest censures of the Church.

As to the celebration of matrimony by a priest, which is necessary to make it a sacrament, the Fathers did not hold this view. Bingham, indeed, argues against Selden, that from the beginning Christians sought sacerdotal benediction in their marriages; and when this fell largely into desuetude after the State became Christian, it was required by law enacted by Charlemagne,

A.D. 780, and in the East by Leo Sapiens, A.D. 900. But it is evident that in every age marriages frequently took place without the presence of a priest, and were held valid by the Church. But those who are curious on this subject, and in regard to the ceremonies connected with matrimony among the primitive Christians, may consult Bingham's "Antiquities," Book xxii., chap. iv. Enough has been said to show that matrimony is no sacrament of the gospel.

§ 9. Extreme Unction.

The last of the pseudo-sacraments repudiated in this article is called Extreme Unction. This has "grown out of the corrupt following of the apostles."

Bailly defines it: "A sacrament of the new law for a sick man conferring special aids for bearing pains, cleansing from sins and the remains of sin, and restoring health of body itself, when it conduces to the salvation of the soul."

The definition of Dens is briefer and more to the point: "A sacrament by which a sick person is anointed with sacred oil by a priest, under a prescribed form of words, for the purpose of healing both the mind and body."

Here we have subject and administrator, matter, form, and effect; but not the divine institution, and that wanting, the *sacrament* is worthless, because spurious.

The Council of Florence says:

> The fifth sacrament is extreme unction, whose matter is oil of olives blessed by a bishop. This sacrament ought not to be given to any except to a sick person who is in danger of death, who is to be anointed in the following places, on the eyes, on account of sight; on the ears, on account of hearing; on the nose, on account of smelling; on the mouth, on account of tasting and speaking; on the hands, on account of touch; on the feet, on account of walking; on the reins, on account of their being the seat of pleasure. The form of this sacrament is this: *By this unction and his own great mercy may God indulge thee whatever sins thou hast committed by sight,* etc., and in like manner by the other members. The minister of this sacrament is a priest; but the effect is the healing of the mind, and, as far as it is fit, of the body also. Concerning this sacrament the blessed Apostle James says (v. 14, 15): "Is any infirm among you? let him send for the presbyters of the Church, and let them pray for him, anointing him with oil in the name of

the Lord: and the prayer of faith will save the sick, and the Lord will relieve him: and if he be in sins, they will be forgiven him."

The Council of Trent says:

This sacred unction of the sick was instituted as a true and proper sacrament

341

of the New Testament by Christ Jesus our Lord, being first intimated by Mark (vi. 13), and afterward recommended and published to the faithful by James the Apostle, brother of our Lord. "Is any man," saith he, "sick among you? let him bring in the priests of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord; and the prayer of faith shall save the sick man; and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him." (James v. 14, 15.) In which words, as the Church has learned by apostolical tradition, handed down from age to age, he teaches the matter, form, proper ministers, and effect of this salutary sacrament.

The Council put forth four canons on this subject:

1. Whoever shall affirm that extreme unction is not truly and properly a sacrament, instituted by Christ our Lord, and published by the blessed Apostle James, but only a ceremony received from the Fathers, or a human invention: let him be accursed.
2. Whoever shall affirm that the sacred unction of the sick does not confer grace, nor forgive sin, nor relieve the sick; but that its power has cessed, as if the gift of healing existed only in past ages: let him be accursed.
3. Whoever shall affirm that the rite and practice of extreme unction observed by the holy Roman Church is repugnant to the doctrine of the blessed Apostle James, and therefore, that it may be altered or despised by Christians without sin: let him be accursed.
4. Whoever shall affirm that the presbyters of the Church, whom blessed James exhorts to be brought in to anoint the sick man, are not priests ordained by the bishop, but persons advanced in years in any community, and therefore that the priest is not the only proper minister of extreme unction: let him be accursed.

The Romanizers of the Church of England seem disposed to escape these Tridentine curses. In "The Pontifical," added to "The Priest's Prayer-book," there is a form for the "consecration of chrism and holy oils." In it is this prescription: "On Maundy-Thursday[15] of each year the bishop shall consecrate the chrism and oils of his diocese after this form." In the course of the communion service the archdeacon or chaplain is to present to the bishop "the vessel

containing the oil for the sick (which shall be brought from the sacristy by one of the assistant ministers, attended by two deacons), saying, 'Reverend Father in God, the oil for the sick.'" The bishop is then to offer a prayer for the descent of the Holy Ghost "upon this fatness of the olive," so that "this oil may by thy blessing be to every one anointed therewith a heavenly medicine and remedy to banish all pain, weakness, and suffering of body and soul." "The balsam and oil for the chrism shall then be carried in two separate

vessels by two priests to the archdeacon, while a third priest bears the vessel in which they are to be mingled." Then follow superstitious prayers, interspersed with the sign of the cross, *e. g.*: "We pray thee, O Lord, that thou wouldst hal ✠ low this matter of holy oil and fragrant balsam, sancti ✠ fying it with the power of thine Anointed. And we humbly beseech thee, O Lord, that thou wouldst enrich this fatness with the might of the Holy Ghost, and make it abound with the sweetness of divine love, and establish it with all bless ✠ ing. Let it be a holy unction and a sweet savor unto thee, a sign of certain victory to those who are born again of water and the Holy Ghost, a joyful anointing, a hope of blessedness, a cleansing from sin, a medicine of life, and a help on their way to the heavenly country." There is an office for the anointing of the sick: "The priest shall take the oil of the sick on his right thumb and therewith touch the sick person, etc., as prescribed by the Council of Florence." The office closes with this sublime direction: "The cottons shall be reverently burnt by the priest."

Now it requires much patience and self-abstention to note and confute statements and arguments so weak and absurd.

First, as to the *institution* of this wonderful sacrament: Romanists say it was instituted by Christ, intimated by Mark, and promulgated by James. As proof that Christ instituted it Dens refers to Thomas Aquinas and the Council of Trent. Of course they got a revelation of it directly from Christ, as there is not a word about this *sacrament* in the New Testament. To refer to Mark vi. 12, 13 is useless. The Roman Catechism says:

> Our Lord himself would, however, seem to have given some indication of it, when he sent his disciples, two and two, before him; for the Evangelist informs us that going forth they preached that all should do penance; and they cast out many devils, and anointed with oil many who were sick, and healed them.

This is hardly a proof-text for *extreme* unction. It is not said that Christ told the apostles to anoint the sick with oil in order to cure them, much less in order to their burial. He usually performed some outward act in working his miracles, and as oil was used for medicinal and similar purposes in those days, the apostles used it, not for its curative properties, but as a symbol of the cure miraculously wrought.

The Roman doctors generally say with Ferrarius, "This sacrament was probably instituted after the resurrection, when

Christ instituted penitence, of which the Council of Trent says extreme unction is the consummation." O those forty days! What a godsend they are! It is a wonder that Pius IX. did not instruct the Vatican Council to say that Christ told the apostles about the immaculate conception sf the Virgin and the infallibility of the Pope, during the forty days.

The Council of Trent curses those who say that this is "only a ceremony received from the Fathers." Well, that curse does not reach us, because we do not say it was received from the Fathers, but emphatically affirm that it was not. There is not the slightest trace of it before the fifth century, when a certain bishop asked Pope Innocent I. whether the sick might be anointed with the oil of chrism, and whether the bishop might anoint with it. The Pope replied that the sick might be anointed with the chrism, and not only by the priests but by all Christians, not only in their own necessities, but in the necessities of any of their friends; and that a bishop might do it, for presbyters only are mentioned by James because the bishop could not go to all the sick, and he who made the chrism might surely anoint with it. There is fine authority for a sacrament. It had become common to use chrism for miraculous cures; from sheer superstition; and one bishop asks another whether it was proper so to do, and whether the bishop might do it—and there is the answer. So the use of "holy water" arose from the use of water in baptism, and the use of "holy bread" from the use of bread in the eucharist. The superstition grew, and after the seventh century oil was used for anointing the sick, with a peculiar office, but it was in order to bodily cure. Of course the patient sometimes recovered—then it was a miracle; but sometimes he died, and then what? In the tenth century the authorities began to say that if it did no good to the body, it did to the soul. And so the schoolmen

developed it into “the sacrament of the dying,” which was decreed by Pope Eugenius and the Councils of Florence and Trent.

The First Prayer-book of Edward VI., “if the sick person desired it,” allowed the anointing, with a prayer for pardon of sins and restoration of bodily health, without attributing any sacramental efficacy to it. But in the Second Prayer-book of King Edward this was omitted. In 1540 Cranmer had asserted that there is no authority in Scripture or antiquity for the Seven

Sacraments, and especially that “unction of the sick with oil to remit venial sins, as it is now used, is not spoken of in Scripture nor in any ancient author.”

As to the *matter* of this sacrament, James does indeed say that the elders of the Church should anoint the sick with oil. But it was not to put him into his coffin, but to raise him up from his sickness. If he had faith enough to be the subject of a miraculous cure, he would have faith to believe to the saving of his soul also, as both usually went together. The prayer of faith procured both the healing of the disease and the pardon of the sin which occasioned it. Compare the case of the man who was cured of his palsy and at the same time pardoned of his sins. (Matt. ix. 1–8.) But who ever heard of any one’s being miraculously cured by extreme unction? The very name of the sacrament shows that Romanists expect no such thing. The priest will not apply the unction till the patient is *in extremis*.

As to the *form*, who can for a moment imagine that Christ or his apostles could prescribe any thing so ridiculous? And then the disputes among the Romanists, whether the form should be optative or indicative, and the like, show the absurdity of this whole business.

As to the *administrator*, he must be a *priest*. Now, there is no priest in the New Testament Church except the Great High-priest, and as all believers constitute a holy priesthood. Consequently, the sacrament cannot be administered, as there is no priest to administer it. The *presbyters* spoken of by James will never do; they were not *sacerdotes*.

Then the *subjects*. It is hard to say who they are. Extreme unction must not be administered to impenitent persons, to those that die in manifest mortal sin, or excommunicated, or unbaptized, or insane if they “lost their reason in an evidently bad state;”

though some Romish doctors say that those who die guilty of mortal sins, as dueling, concubinage, voluntary and complete drunkenness, and who are suddenly deprived of their reason in the very act of sin, may receive this sacrament, because it may be supposed that if they had had time and the use of their reason they would have repented. What a license to sin! What damnable impiety!

As to the *effects* of this sacrament—sanctifying or sacramental grace, cleansing from the remains of sin and alleviation of mind,

remission of sins, and bodily healing—when did any one ever know of these effects being realized in a single case? In answer to prayer a sick man may have his affliction sanctified to him, and his bodily health restored; but it is absurd to use oil for this purpose, as the apostles used it only as a symbol of miraculous healing. Indeed, the Council of Trent says: "Christianity, now that it has taken deep root in the minds of men, stands less in need of the aid of such miracles in our days than in the early ages of the Church." And if the Council had added that all the accounts of miracles performed by extreme unction, or by other incantations, were nothing but idle tales and lying wonders, it would only have told the truth.

When Romanists say that as Christ instituted the sacrament of baptism for those coming into the world, he must, by parity, have instituted extreme unction for those going out of it, it can only be replied that this is as good an argument for it as they can adduce, and we shall not attempt to answer it.

We conclude this discussion, perhaps too far extended, in the language of the great Roman doctor, Cajetan:

> It neither appears by the words (James v. 14, 15) nor by the effect, that St. James speaks of the sacrament of extreme unction, but rather of that unction which our Lord appointed in the gospel to be used on sick persons by his disciples [or, which they used]. For the text does not say, *Is a man sick unto death?* but absolutely, *Is any* sick? And it makes the effect to be the *recovery* of the *sick*, and speaks but conditionally of the forgiveness of sins; whereas extreme unction is not given but when a man is almost at the point of death; and as the form of words thus used sufficiently shows, it tends directly to the forgiveness of sins.

1. See Dr. Etheridge, in his valuable work on “The Syrian Churches,” pp. 95, 96.↩
2. “Compendium,” etc., Vol. III., pp. 305, 306.↩
3. See Bingham’s “Antiquities,” etc., Vol. II , pp. 1068, 1069.↩
4. The final clause the Revised Version translates as follows: “but are not of any value against the indulgence of the flesh.” This is more perspicuous and forcible.—T.↩
5. Burnet, “Exposition of the XXXIX. Articles,” pp. 370, 371.↩
6. In the early Church, from the close of the second century, the term *ordo* simply distinguished between the clergy and the laity, the former being the *ordo ecclasiasticus*. Until a comparatively late date in their history, the English Wesleyan Conference did not use the ceremony of imposition of hands in designating to the ministerial office.—T.↩
7. Dr. Miner Raymond’s “Systematic Theology,” Vol. III., pp. 460–463.↩
8. Dr. Whedon’s posthumously published “Essays, Reviews, and Discourses,” Vol. I., p. 162.↩
9. “Essays, Reviews, and Discourses,” Vol. I., pp. 170, 171.↩
10. “Essays, Reviews,” etc., Vol. I., pp. 160–162.↩
11. *Ibid.*, Vol. I., pp. 173, 174.↩
12. *Ibid.*, Vol. I., p. 197.↩
13. “Systematic Theology,” Vol. III., pp. 465–473.↩
14. The word “mystery,” in this and all similar passages throughout the New Testament, does not mean that which is inherently dark and unintelligible. It does not refer to any thing that is incomprehensible, either because of its own nature, or on account of the finiteness of the human mind. It applies to an object which God, for wise purposes, has concealed or hidden, which he, at the proper time, uncovers, manifests, or reveals, and which, when revealed, is perfectly comprehensible by human intelligence. God’s mystery is simply God’s secret, and God’s secret is God’s gospel, which, though of eternal ordination, the Jews and nations of the earth did not recognize till it was revealed by Christ and his apostles, in the fullness of the time.—T.↩
15. The Thursday in passion-week—the day before Good-Friday.—T.↩

Chapter III.
The Use And Abuse of Sacraments.

346

The fourth and last paragraph of this article reads thus:

> The sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon, or to be carried about; but that we should duly use them. And in such only as worthily receive the same they have a wholesome effect or operation; but they that receive them unworthily purchase to themselves condemnation, as St. Paul saith, 1 Cor. xi. 29.

Mr. Wesley substituted "condemnation" for "damnation" in the English article; and in 1816 "1 Cor. xi. 29" was added.

§ 1. The Abuse.

There are two points embraced in this paragraph, one negative and one positive. The negative point is this: "The sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon, or to be carried about; but that we should duly use them."

This statement, which is repeated with special reference to the Lord's-supper in Article XVIII., is here made in reference to both sacraments, because of the repudiation of the *opus operatum* in the next sentence. The Romanists hold that "the grace of the sacraments is contained in the sacraments." This led to a superstitious reverence for the elements themselves, the elevation and adoration of "the host," sacramental processions, and the like, of which there is not the slightest hint in the New Testament.

In baptism, water is brought and applied to the subject, or the subject is taken to the water, as may be most convenient; and when the ceremony is performed there is no further use for the water.

In the Lord's-supper, bread and wine are set apart, broken and poured out, distributed, eaten, and drunk, in commemoration of Christ's atoning death; and when the ceremony is performed there is no further use for the bread and wine which may be left.

But this subject comes up again in Article XVIII.

347

The concluding sentence is this: “And in such only as worthily receive the same, they have a wholesome effect or operation; but they that receive them unworthily purchase to themselves condemnation, as St. Paul saith, 1 Cor. xi. 29.”

In the Latin recension the reading is grep *salutarem habent effectum*, “have a salutary effect.” The words “or operation” were added in the English recension, to define the word “effect.”

The allusion is to the *opus operatum* of the Papists. The Council of Trent, seventh session, Canons 6, 7, 8, set forth their views on this subject:

1. Whoever shall affirm that the sacraments of the new law do not contain the grace which they signify, or that they do not confer that grace on those who place no obstacle in its way, as if they were only the external signs of grace or righteousness received by faith, and marks of Christian profession, whereby the faithful are distinguished from unbelievers: let him be accursed.
2. Whoever shall say that grace is not always given by these sacraments, and upon all persons, as far as God is concerned, if they be rightly received, but that it is only bestowed sometimes and on some persons: let him be accursed.
3. Whoever shall say that grace is not conferred by the sacraments of the new law, by their own power [*ex opere operato*] but that faith in the divine promise is all that is necessary to obtain grace: let him be accursed.

Some Romanists, however, hold that the sacraments confer grace *ex opere operantis*. Dens says, it is one thing to cause grace *ex opere operantis*, and another *ex opere operato*, and another as *conditio sine qua non*, and adds, “It is one thing to confer grace *ex opere operato* physically, another only morally.” He says:

To cause grace *ex opere operantis* is to cause it from the merit of the operator, whether minister or receiver, or from the peculiar value of the work, as it proceeds from the operator, that is, from the singular devotion of the minister. To cause grace *ex opere operato*, is to cause it, not from the merits of the minister or the receiver, but from the power and influence of the work or sacramental action, which is, by divine institution, employed in effecting in the receiver (provided every hinderance be out of the way) that which it signifies.

Bailly says: “To produce grace *ex opere operato*, is to confer it by the power of the external act instituted by Christ, provided there is no hinderance. But to produce grace *ex opere operantis*, is to confer it on account of the merits and dispositions of the receiver or minister.”

Thomas Aquinas and his followers, the Thomists, Dens, and other eminent Romanists, held that

348

The sacraments possess a physical causality, as the instruments of the divine omnipotence, and truly and properly concur toward the production of their effects in the mind by a supernatural virtue from the principal agent, communicated to it and united to it in the name of a transient action; that such a causality is more conformable to the declarations of Scripture, and demonstrates more fully the dignity of the sacraments, and the efficacy of the divine omnipotence and of the merits of Christ. Besides, they say this is more conformable to the sentiments of Councils and Fathers, who, as they explain the causality of the sacraments, use many similitudes which undoubtedly designate a causality more than usual.

On the contrary Scotus and the Scotists, Bonaventura, Ferrarius, Bailly, and many other eminent Romanists, hold that

The sacraments do not cause grace physically, but morally; that is, they do not produce grace as physical causes do, but as moral causes, inasmuch as they efficaciously move God to produce the grace which they signify, and which God himself promises infallibly to give as often as they are rightly administered and worthily received. The reason is, because the mode of operation follows the mode of existence. But the sacraments, as sacraments, are something moral, depending solely on the institution of Christ, from which, and from the merits of Christ, they possess their entire force and efficacy of causation; so that their manner of operation is not physical, but moral.

When Romanists speak of “the sacraments being rightly administered,” they mean that all the essentials are present, including the “intention” of the priest, without which there is no valid sacrament, and of course no effect, physical or moral.

Now amid all these subtle distinctions, doubts, and contradictions, how can any one form any conception of what is the effect or operation of the sacraments? It is useless to refer to the Scriptures for support, as they are entirely silent in regard to the *opus operatum*. They sometimes, indeed, speak of the sign for the thing signified, water for the regenerating and sanctifying grace which it signifies, and bread and wine for the body and blood of

Christ, signified by those elements, but in a hundred places they testify that the spiritual, saving effect is produced not by the outward act, but by the grace which it symbolizes, and which is not tied to the sign, though never absent when it is worthily received, and never present when it is received unworthily, as our article affirms.

So the Fathers sometimes speak in unguarded language of the effect or operation of the sacraments, yet when there was occasion for it they plainly stated that grace is not tied to the sacrament. Thus Origen says: "All are not baptized with the Spirit who are baptized with water. He who is baptized to salvation

receives water and the Holy Spirit, but Simon, not being baptized to salvation, received water, but not the Spirit of God." Even Tertullian held that baptism to unworthy recipients would be not the fountain of life, but rather the symbol of death. So Cyril says: "Simon Magus was baptized, but not illuminated." So Augustin:

> The laver of regeneration is common to all baptized in the name of the Trinity, but the grace of baptism is not common to all. The sacrament is one thing, and the grace of the sacrament is another. How many eat of the altar, and die, ay, and die by eating! "Wherefore," saith the apostle, "he eateth and drinketh condemnation to himself." If, therefore, thou wilt know that thou hast received the Spirit, ask thine own heart, lest perchance thou hast the sacrament, but not the virtue of the sacrament.

It would have been well if these Fathers and their followers had always spoken in this Protestant, Scriptural style. The schoolmen, to reconcile the unguarded statements of the Fathers with these views, originated the theory of the *opus operatum*. The sacraments contain and convey grace to all who receive them. All, however unworthy, eat and drink the real body and blood of Christ in the eucharist; but to the unworthy it is not to salvation, but to condemnation. Simon received baptism and the grace of baptism: he was regenerated by baptism, but regenerated to a greater condemnation. This is blasphemy. To what lengths will not error go?

The most acute Romanist can give no rational explanation of the *opus operatum*, whether physical or moral. Even the Council of Trent qualifies the statement concerning the conferring of grace in the sacrament: it is to those who "place no obstacle in the way." This, as Browne says, does not materially differ from the statements of the English Reformers. They held that infants, for example, who

cannot place any bar in the way, are always regenerated in or by baptism. Their views on this subject were very nebulous, as we may have occasion to note in discussing the next article.

We do not deny that the inward and spiritual grace of the sacraments is always imparted to those who receive them by a true faith; but we deny that the elements contain or confer the grace: they only symbolize, seal it, and assist, as a means, in receiving it. They do not operate as a charm, or work like a medicine. They set forth great spiritual truths, and assist the mind in laying hold on them, as we have shown; and this is their sole

province and effect. The Holy Spirit alone imparts the power, and secures the saving effect. “It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing.” (John vi.)

Regeneration has been experienced by thousands who were never baptized; and millions have been baptized, but never regenerated. So of the other sacrament. Even Luther, with all his high notions of baptismal regeneration and the real corporeal presence in the eucharist, repudiated the *opus operatum*. He complained that the schoolmen and the Papists dreamed of virtue infused into the water of baptism, while he held that the gift of the Spirit to the baptized results from the promise of God to them, but that the water was still but water. By his notion of consubstantiation an unworthy communicant might eat and drink the bread and wine, but not the body and blood of Christ; because, though they are present in the eucharist, the bread and wine are present too, unchanged; whereas, according to the Romish dogma of transubstantiation, the good and bad alike eat the body of Christ, into which the elements are changed.

It is thus clear that the “salutary effect or operation” of the sacraments is not *ex opere operato*, but depends upon their worthy reception. The condemnation purchased to themselves—that is, procured—by those who receive the sacraments unworthily, referred to by St. Paul, 1 Cor. xi. 29, does not mean eternal damnation. Κρίμα there means judicial infliction of disease or death, as a retribution on those who prostituted the Lord’s-supper by making it a convivial entertainment. Eternal damnation would of course ensue if they did not repent and obtain forgiveness for so enormous a crime. Though no such judicial inflictions are administered in retribution of such profanation of the sacrament in

our age, yet it is always accompanied by the divine displeasure, and, without repentance, will result in eternal damnation.

Part V.

Article XVII.
Of Baptism.

351

Baptism is not only a sign of profession, and mark of difference, whereby Christians are distinguished from others that are not baptized, but it is also a sign of regeneration, or the new birth. The baptism of young children is to be retained in the Church.

Introduction.

This is a considerable abridgment of the Twenty-seventh Anglican Article:

> Baptism is not only a sign of profession, and mark of difference, whereby Christian men are discerned from others that be not christened; but it is also a sign of regeneration, or new birth, whereby, as by an instrument, they that receive baptism rightly are grafted into the Church; the promises of the forgiveness of sins, and of our adoption to be the sons of God by the Holy Ghost, are visibly signed and sealed; faith is confirmed, and grace increased by virtue of prayer unto God. The baptism of young children is in any wise to be retained in the Church, as most agreeable with the institution of Christ.

This expansion of the benefits of baptism may well be spared; it is unnecessary, ambiguous, and very liable to abuse, as it has been grossly abused; though perhaps it was designed, and may be interpreted, in a good sense. All that is valuable in it will be brought out in the discussion of our article.

Chapter I.
Definition and Significance of Baptism.

§ 1. Definition.

352
The article does not give a formal definition of Baptism; a knowledge of that is presupposed. It might not be amiss, however, to define this sacrament.

Webster says it is “the application of water to a person, as a sacrament or religions ceremony, by which he is initiated into the visible Church of Christ.”

In Summers’s Treatise on Baptism it is thus defined: “Baptism is an ordinance instituted by Christ, consisting in the application of water by a Christian minister to suitable persons, for their initiation into the visible Church, and consecration to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.”

§ 2. Judaic, Johannine, and Christian Baptism.

This, of course, refers to Christian baptism. Baptism, as a religious rite, was familiar to the Jews before the Christian ordinance was instituted. Hence the Jews expressed no surprise when John the Baptist began to baptize, as if it were something novel. They were accustomed to receive proselytes from heathenism, men, women, and children, by baptism, as well as by sacrifice and by circumcision (in the case of males). This ceremonial washing denoted their purification from the filthiness of idolatry, which they formally renounced, and professed their faith in Judaism, and engaged themselves to fulfill all the requirements of the law of Moses. John’s baptism was not proselyte baptism. He baptized Jews, on their profession of repentance and faith in the Messiah who was shortly to make his appearance. It corresponded to the peculiar character of his dispensation, which was, as the Fathers expressed it, a kind of bridge passing over from Judaism to Christianity. Like Christian baptism, it symbolized purity of heart

and life, and was “for the remission of sins,” as the exponent of repentance and faith, on which remission has always been conditioned.

353

It differed from proselyte baptism, as it was not restricted to heathens embracing Judaism, and it confessed faith in the Messiah, who was shortly to make his appearance, which proselyte baptism did not. It differed from Christian baptism, which embraces all the world, Jews and Gentiles, and which recognizes Jesus as the Messiah who was to come, as well as the Holy Spirit, in whose dispensation it is administered. (Matt. xviii. 19, 20; Acts xix. 2–5; 1 Cor. xii. 13.) John’s baptism was recognized and ratified by Christ, as he submitted to it for his public inauguration to his Messianic work (Matt. iii.; Luke iii.; John i.); and as he, or his disciples for him, practiced it during his stay upon the earth (John iii.; iv.). Christian baptism was instituted by Christ, and so made the perpetual initiating ordinance of his Church, after his resurrection, and before his ascension to heaven.

Thus in the great commission given to his disciples on the mountain in Galilee, he said: “All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.” (Matt. xxviii. 18–20.) And again, when he renewed the commission, just as he was about to ascend to heaven, he said unto them: “Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned.” (Mark xvi. 15, 16.)

§ 3. The Apostolic Practice.

That the apostles understood this to be the institution of an ordinance which was to be perpetuated in the Church is obvious from their constant practice of it. Thus on the Day of Pentecost, when those who were “pricked in their heart said unto Peter and to the rest of the apostles, Men and brethren, what shall we do? Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall

receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. . . . Then they that gladly received his word were baptized." (Acts ii 37–41.) So when Philip preached Christ unto the Samaritans, "when they believed Philip, . . . they

were baptized, both men and women." (Acts viii. 12.) So when Saul was converted he was baptized. (Acts ix. 18.) When Cornelius and his friends received the word, and the Holy Ghost fell on them, Peter said "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we? And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord." (Acts x. 47, 48.) Instead of considering their baptism by the Spirit as an argument against their being baptized, by water, Peter considered it a reason for their baptism. They had received the thing signified, and they ought therefore to receive the sign—the outward attestation of it. So when Lydia and the jailer believed they were baptized, and their families with them. (Acts xvi.) When the twelve disciples of John at Ephesus were informed that the Christian baptism which recognized Jesus as the Messiah had superseded John's baptism, which only pledged them to believe on Him which should come after him—"when they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus." (Acts xix. 1–6.) So through the Epistles of the apostles baptism by water is as familiarly spoken of as a Christian ordinance to which all Christian believers submitted, and by which they were incorporated into the mystical body, or Church, of Christ. One might as well attempt to prove that there is no material world, that man has no body, but is all spirit, as to attempt to prove that water baptism is not a permanent ordinance in the Church, but that it has been superseded by the baptism of the Spirit. In every case, from the times of the apostles to the present, Christians of every name (with the exception of here and there a fragment) have recognized baptism with water as an ordinance of Christ of binding force to the end of time.

§ 4. Baptism a Sign of Christian Profession.

The article says baptism is a sign in two senses: it "is not only a sign of profession and mark of difference, whereby Christians are distinguished from others that are not baptized, but it is also a sign

of regeneration, or the new birth."

When it is spoken of as "a sign of profession and mark of difference, whereby Christians are distinguished from others that are not baptized," it is the same as saying that by baptism we are formally initiated into the Church of Christ. It is an act of matriculation

by which we are admitted as disciples into the school of Christ. It is an act of naturalization, an oath of allegiance, in which, renouncing the world, the flesh, and the devil, we acknowledge Christ as our King, and swear fealty and obedience to the constitution and laws of the realm. By this *sacramentum*, we enter the sacramental host of God's elect, and swear fidelity to the Captain of our salvation. It is thus, as expressed in the Sixteenth Article , a "badge or token of Christian men's profession." It is not indeed an indelible, physical sign like the correspondent patriarchal and Jewish rite, which, indeed, was not exposed to public view. But, as the experience of eighteen centuries shows, it answers the same purpose,

For water seals the blessing now
Which once was sealed with blood.

By this outward and visible sign "we are grafted into the Church." Baptism puts us into the visible Church, as the thing signified by it puts us into the invisible Church.

Nicodemus was familiar with baptism—proselyte Jewish baptism and John's baptism—hence our Lord addressed him, "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God." (John iii. 5.) Unless he is born of water, that is, baptized, he can not enter into the outward and visible kingdom, which is the Church; unless he is born of the Spirit, realizes the thing signified by the sign, he can not enter into the immortal and invisible kingdom of grace or glory.

The same thing is taught in Titus iii. 5, 6: "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost; which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour." We are saved symbolically and instrumentally by the laver of regeneration, which is baptism with water, and we are saved really and spiritually by the thing signified, the renewing of

the Holy Ghost, whose copious affusion is signified in baptism.

So baptism is called by Peter (1 Pet. iii. 21) the antitype of the preservation of Noah and his family in the ark—the one being a corporeal, the other a spiritual salvation; yet Peter is careful to state that there is no real saving virtue in the purification of the body by the water of baptism, which symbolizes

356

and seals that which is stipulated by God and us in this ordinance, and which alone saves us.[1]

Paul says: "By one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free." (1 Cor. xii. 13.) He is speaking of the dispensation of the Spirit, dividing gifts to all the members of the Church, which is spoken of as the body of Christ, into which all are incorporated under the dispensation of the Spirit. Every thing done in the Church—preaching, prophesying, praying, working miracles, celebrating sacraments—all is carried on under the direction of the Spirit and according to the gifts dispensed by him.

So Paul tells the Galatians: "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus. And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." (Gal. iii. 27–29.)

To put on Christ is to profess his religion, and this is done in baptism, by which we are incorporated into his mystical body, which is the Church, constituted of believers of every nation, condition, and sex. The Fathers, therefore, properly speak of

357

baptism as *janua ecclesiae*, the door of the Church, the initiatory ordinance of the kingdom of God.

Baptism is *ipso facto* initiation into the visible Church. It is a Church ordinance; it is administered by the Church, under the authority of its great Head. The administrator, indeed, is not of the essence of the sacrament, as if he must be a minister of the word to make it a valid ordinance. There is no proof that Ananias who baptized Saul was a minister of the word, though he was a Christian. There is no proof that those who applied the water in the baptism of Cornelius and his friends were ministers of the word; it

would seem that they were not; but they were Christians, and they acted under the authority of the apostle, and that was enough. Paul seldom baptized his own converts; he left that for others to do—the mere manual act being subordinate to the preaching of the gospel, and yet more liable to be abused than that to sinister ends. (1 Cor. i. 13–17.) If the seal of state be applied to a charter by competent authority, it matters nothing who may manipulate the sealing instrument; the seal impressed is valid, and authenticates the charter. Yet for the sake of order and regularity it is well that those who preach the word should also administer the sacraments; by the one they address the ear, by the other the eye and other senses. All things should be done decently and in order.

If the Council of Trent had not entertained unscriptural views of the absolute necessity of baptism for salvation, it would not have authorized women, infidels, and Jews, to administer the ordinance. The Reformers generally disallowed this, though they did not invalidate baptisms which had been so administered.

Protestants, for the most part, recognize the validity of baptisms performed by Romish priests and ministers of all other communions, in which the essentials of the sacrament are comprehended. In doubtful cases the party is allowed the benefit of the doubt, and is rebaptized if he desires it, with or without a hypothetical clause, as in the Church of England. “If thou art not already baptized, N., I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.” Indeed, that Church requires this, “If they which bring the infants to the Church do make such answers to the priest’s questions as that it cannot appear that the child was baptized with water, in the

name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, which are essential parts of baptism.”

Calvin lays great stress upon the fact that baptism derives its virtue from God who enjoins it, and not from man who administers it. He says (Book IV., 15):

> Baptism is a sign of initiation, by which we are admitted into the society of the Church, in order that, being incorporated into Christ, we may be numbered among the children of God. It has been given to us by God, first, to promote our faith toward him; secondly, to testify our confession before men. For it is a mark by which we openly profess our desire to be numbered among the people of God, by which we testify our agreement

with all Christians in the worship of one God, and in one religion, and by which we make a public declaration of our faith. This is what Paul meant when he said that "by one Spirit we are all baptized into one body." (1 Cor. xii, 13.) Now, if it be true, as we have stated, that a sacrament is to be considered as received, not so much from the hand of him by whom it is administered, as from the hand of God himself, from whom, without doubt, it proceeded, we may conclude that it is not capable of any addition or diminution from the dignity of the person by whose hand it is delivered. And as among men, if a letter be sent, provided the hand and seal of the writer be known, it is of very little importance who and what the carrier of it may be, so it ought to be sufficient for us to know the hand and seal of our Lord in his sacraments, by whatever messengers they may be conveyed. This fully refutes the error of the Donatists, who measured the virtue and value of the sacraments by the worthiness of the minister. Such, in the present day, are our Anabaptists, who positively deny that we are rightly baptized because we were baptized by impious and idolatrous ministers in the kingdom of the pope, and therefore violently urge us to be baptized again; against whose follies we shall be fortified with an argument of sufficient strength if we consider that we are baptized not in the name of any man, but in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, and consequently that it is not the baptism of man, but of God, by whomsoever it is administered. Though those who baptized us were chargeable with the grossest ignorance or contempt of God and of all religion, yet they did not baptize us into the fellowship of their own ignorance or sacrilege, but into the faith of Jesus Christ; because they invoked not their own name, but the name of God, and baptized in no other name but his.

The article well says, therefore, that "baptism is a sign of profession and mark of difference whereby Christians are distinguished from others that are not baptized," or "whereby," as the English article develops this point, "they are grafted into the Church."

The Wesleyan Catechism exactly agrees with the article.

What are the actual privileges of baptized persons?

They are made members of the visible Church of Christ; their gracious relation to him as the Second Adam, and as the Mediator of the new covenant, is solemnly

ratified by divine appointment; and they are thereby recognized as having a claim to all those spiritual blessings of which they are the proper subjects.

By baptism they are made members of "the holy catholic Church, the communion of saints," not of any particular Church,

only as the catholic Church is made up of particular Churches, and we must necessarily, except in very peculiar cases, hold our membership in the former through the latter.

§ 5. Objections to This Teaching Considered.

Some object to this teaching of the article and of the Catechism.

1. One class of objectors assert that baptism is not a Church ordinance at all; that it is administered out of the Church, and the subject thereof is not made a member but by some act subsequent to his baptism.

Thus John Bunyan, in his "Differences in Judgment about Water Baptism, no Bar to Communion:" "Baptism makes thee no member of the Church, neither doth it make thee a visible saint: it giveth thee, therefore, neither right to, nor being of, membership at all." "No man baptizeth by virtue of his office in the Church; no man is baptized by virtue of his membership there." "Baptism is not the initiating ordinance." "Water baptism hath nothing to do in a Church, as a Church: it neither bringeth us into the Church, nor is any part of our worship when we come there."

Dr. Gill says:

> Baptism is not a Church ordinance: I mean, it is not an ordinance administered in the Church, but *out of it, and in order to admission into it*, and communion with it; it is preparatory to it, and a qualification for it; it does not make a person a member of a Church, or admit him into a visible Church. Persons must first be baptized and then added to the Church, as the three thousand converts were. A Church has nothing to do with the baptism of any, but to be satisfied that they are baptized before they are admitted into communion with it.

Very few, we believe, indorse this erroneous view of the subject; and it may be doubted if it ever would have found favor with any, had they not confounded a particular Church with the Church catholic.

It may be true that the mere act of baptism does not make one a member of any particular Church, but it does not follow that it does not make one a member of the catholic Church of Christ. When Philip baptized the eunuch he did not make him by that act a member of the Church at Jerusalem, or Samaria; and as

360
there was no Church in the desert where he was baptized, or in Ethiopia, where he resided, his baptism made him a member of no particular Church; but it made him a member of the holy catholic Church, and entitled him to recognition by the faithful in any place where there was a particular Church, so long as he was true to his baptismal obligations; and indeed it constituted him the nucleus of a particular Church, in his distant heathen home. It was therefore as truly an "initiating ordinance" to him as if it had introduced him to the immediate society of the apostles and brethren at Jerusalem.

Baptism is the ordinance of initiation in the Christian Church, in the same way that circumcision was the ordinance of initiation in the Jewish Church. Whatever other ceremonies obtained in the case of the recognition of members in the Jewish Church, particularly in regard to synagogue privileges and obligations, no one was considered a Jew until he was circumcised according to the law, and no one who was thus circumcised was considered an alien from the commonwealth of Israel until he committed some crime by which he canceled his circumcision. The analogy obtains in regard to baptism as the ordinance of initiation into the Christian Church.[2]

2. Another class of objectors to the common view of baptism, as the initiating ordinance, affirm that none are eligible to baptism, but those who are already members of the Church.

Thus the Directory of the Westminster Assembly teaches "that the seed and posterity of the faithful, born within the Church, have by their birth interest in the covenant and right to the seal of it; that they are Christians and federally holy before baptism, and therefore they are baptized."

And so in the Larger Catechism:

> Baptism is not to be administered to any that are out of the visible Church, and so strangers from the covenant of promise till they profess their faith in Christ, and obedience to him; but infants descending from parents, either both
>
> 361
>
> or but one of them professing faith in Christ, and obedience to him, are in that respect within the covenant, and are to be baptized.

"The children of professing Christians," says Dr. Miller, "are already in the Church. They are born members. They are baptized because they were members. They received the seal of the covenant because they are already in the covenant by virtue of their birth."

This birthright theory, therefore, does not consider baptism as the door of admission into the Church. The advocates of this system do not administer baptism as the formal medium of initiation into membership, but as the recognition of the birthright membership previously existent. They do not administer the ordinance to any infants except such as are born of Christian parentage; one, at least, of the parents must be a member of the Church. No matter if the unfortunate child be "born in our house, or bought with our money of any stranger that is not of our seed" (Gen. xvii. 12, 13), this birthright basis denies him a privilege which was secured by a provision of the Abrahamic dispensation to a child similarly circumstanced. Most certainly such an ecclesiastical ostracism receives no indorsement from a dispensation whose benevolently aggressive character is never more sublimely illustrated than when its ministers are engaged in discipling all nations, introducing them to the fold of Christ by the ordinance of his own appointment.

It is worthy of remark that this birthright basis of Church-membership is inconsistent with a leading, though equally erroneous, principle of the theological system of those divines by whom it is asserted.

They maintain that the Church is constituted of a certain definite number of men who, before the foundation of the world, were separated from the common mass of transgressors by the electing grace of God, and who are therefore to be considered members of the mystical body of Christ, though for the greater portion of their lives they may give no evidence of a vital union with him. This vital union, however, will in every case be secured by "effectual calling," even though in some cases it may not be consummated until the article of death.

Thus Dr. Owen ("Glory of Christ," c. x.):

> In order unto the production and perfecting of the new creation, God did from eternity, in the holy purpose of his will, prepare, and in design set apart unto

> himself, that portion of mankind whereof it was to consist. Hereby they were the only peculiar matter that was to be wrought upon by the Holy Ghost, and the glorious fabric of the Church erected out of it. What was said, it may be, of the natural body by the psalmist is true of the mystical body of Christ, which is principally intended, Ps. cxxxix. 15, 16: "My substance was not hid from thee, when I was made in secret, and curiously wrought in the lowest parts of the earth. Thine eyes did see my substance

yet being unperfect, and in thy book all my members were written, which in continuance were fashioned, when as yet there was none of them." The substance of the Church whereof it was to be formed was under the eye of God, as proposed in the decree of election; yet was it as such unperfect. It was not formed or shaped into members of the mystical body. But they were all written in the book of life. And in pursuance of the purpose of God there they are by the Holy Spirit, in the whole course and continuance of time in their several generations, fashioned into the shape designed for them.

This view is substantially entertained by all those divines who interpret the ninth of Romans and similar passages of Scripture of the unconditional, personal, and eternal election and reprobation of the children of men. It is a little remarkable, however, that "the prince of divines," as Dr. Owen is sometimes called, should have recourse to the one hundred and thirty-ninth psalm to sustain his theory. Every child that reads this fine ode must know that the psalmist speaks in the quoted passage of one of the profound mysteries of nature; and neither the terms of the text nor the scope of the context will warrant so outrageous and far-fetched a gloss as the doctor places upon it when he says that the scheme of election "is principally intended." His theory, however, called for support, and Scripture being slow and chary in furnishing plain passages for that purpose, he had recourse to this curious and figurative text, which indeed furnishes as much support to this system as any other —that is to say, just none at all.

The Bible nowhere affirms that the Church is supplied with its members by such an act of preterition as is here affirmed. It does indeed speak of an election which took place before the subjects thereof were born; but this was not a personal, individual election, but rather an election of communities, first of Jews, then of Gentiles, to spiritual privileges which the parties, in their individual, personal capacity, might forfeit or secure by the perverse or proper use of their moral agency. (Rom. ix.–xi.) But it speaks of another election which takes place after the birth of the subjects thereof, and in every case

conditional, being suspended upon "repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ." (John v. 40; Acts ii. 38; iii. 19; viii. 36, 37; xvi. 30, 31; xx. 21; Eph. i. 13; Gal. iii. 26–29; Heb. ii.–iv.) This election is not irreversible; but there is an election which is

irreversible; it is personal too, but then it is conditional: “Give diligence to make your calling and election sure; for if ye do these things, ye shall never fall; for so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.” (2 Pet. i. 10, 11.) “Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city.” (Rev. xxii. 14. *Cf.* Matt. vli.; xxv.; Mark xvi. 16; John v. 28, 29; 1 Cor. ix. 27; 2 Thess. i.)

Dr. Owen’s allegory stands but a poor chance when confronted with these plain and uncompromising passages of Holy Writ. We could multiply texts of this complexion, but one citation is sufficient to show that the impenitent and unbelieving sinner is not enrolled in the Book of Life. We are under no obligation to credit the absurdity that a man’s membership in the Church was irreversibly determined thousands of ages before he was born; or that while he is making God to serve with his sins, and wearying him with his iniquities (Isa. xliii. 24), he sustains any other relation to the great Head of the Church than that of a miserable reprobate, in common with all other transgressors—eligible, indeed, to admission into the household of faith by a proper improvement of the grace which is freely offered to all; but until then an “alien from the commonwealth of Israel, and a stranger from the covenants of promise.” (Eph. ii. 12.)

It is no part of our present duty, however, to enlarge upon the absurdity of this election basis of Church-membership. We have called attention to it to show its incompatibility with the birthright basis, although both principles are embraced in one and the same theological system.

Observe, all children of Christian parentage are considered members of the Church, and yet on the foregoing basis of fore-ordination only a small number of them are “elect infants,” and consequently all the remainder are reprobates: they have not, nor can they ever have, nor was it intended they should ever have, any part or lot in the matter. If any of these reprobate infants die in infancy, they do not die in connection with the

Church on earth, nor can they be admitted into the Church in heaven.[3] If they survive the period of infancy, their case remains unchanged: it is in vain for them to say, “We have Abraham to our

father;" they are the limbs of Satan, and nothing can constitute them the members of Christ. The number of both parties is so definite that it can neither be diminished nor increased. This is the plain and acknowledged doctrine of those who place the membership of the Church on the basis of election. Now, unless it be affirmed that all the children of Christian parents are embraced in this scheme of election—which none of its abettors have the temerity to assert—it is obviously in direct opposition to this theory to recognize their membership on the ground of their Christian parentage.

It will not do to say that election makes them members of the invisible Church, and Christian parentage makes them members of the visible Church. According to the theory in question, they are baptized in virtue of their birthright membership, and their baptism *seals* to them all the blessings of the covenant of grace, which inure to those alone who are members of the invisible as well as the visible Church. They are all considered parties to the covenant, from which the reprobate are eternally excluded. The birthright basis is therefore utterly incompatible with the scheme of election, while neither the one nor the other derives the slightest support from the word of God.

The patronage of St. Paul, however, is challenged for the hereditary basis of Church-membership: "For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband; else were your children unclean; but now are they holy." (1 Cor. vii. 14.)

Numerous are the interpretations of this difficult passage; but as it regards the terms *holy* and *unclean*, here used of children as

the offspring of believing or unbelieving parents, the meaning seems to be that if one of the parents were a Christian, the children would be consecrated to the true God, and therefore would be relatively holy—not before, but after and in consequence of, baptism—whereas if both parties were heathens, the children, according to the heathen custom, would be consecrated to false gods, and therefore would be relatively unclean.[4] But this does not prove that the children in the former case were entitled to baptism by virtue of the believing parent's faith, or that in the latter case it would be unlawful to baptize them.

If the children of heathens were in some cases admitted to the

fellowship of the Abrahamic and Jewish Churches by circumcision, there is no reason that the course described by Augustin may not obtain in the Christian Church. He remarks:

> It sometimes happens that the children of slaves are brought to baptism by their master; sometimes, the parent being dead, friends alive undertake that office; sometimes strangers, or virgins consecrated to God who neither have nor can have children of their own, take up infants in the open streets, and so offer them unto baptism, whom the cruelty of unnatural parents casteth out, and leaveth to the adventure of uncertain pity.

And surely the Church is not obliged to reject the little ones because the parents may not be alive and consenting to the consecration. It was somewhat bold in Dr. Dwight to affirm: "Unbelieving parents, St. Paul has declared, cannot offer their children in baptism: and that, notwithstanding themselves have been baptized." (Ser. clx. *ad fin.*) We find no such language in the writings of the apostle.

Whenever therefore the Church can receive these little ones into her bosom it is her duty to do so; and her ministers should raise no objection to this benevolent arrangement on the score of unknown, or questionable, or wicked parentage; provided always, that the guardians of the children voluntarily surrender them to her maternal care, as Christianity admits of no compulsion.

The faith of the parent affects the Church-membership of the child only in one way: as a Christian he would be more likely to offer his child to baptism than if he were an unbeliever; and

it is in this ordinance the child is *formally* brought into union with the Church, while his eligibility to the ordinance is secured "by the righteousness of One, by whom the free gift has come upon all men unto justification of life." (Rom. v.) This gracious arrangement constitutes a *virtual*, and baptism a *formal*, union with the Church. The former is the blood-bought inheritance of every child, accruing to him from the moment of his birth, and is entirely independent of parental character; and neither reason nor revelation has placed the latter on any different basis.

Those who adopt the hereditary principle are forced to forbid a multitude of those blood-bought infants, whom the Saviour has invited, to enter the Church, and they will answer for it to its exalted Head. The best apology they will be able to make is

involuntary mistake, which no doubt will be accepted by our merciful Judge.

The truth on this subject, however, is so obvious that it cannot be altogether overlooked or ignored by the advocates of the error we have just refuted. Thus the Westminster Directory, in contradiction of its other instructions on baptism, teaches "that children by baptism are solemnly received into the bosom of the visible Church, distinguished from the world and them that are without, and united with believers." And the Larger Catechism teaches that "baptism is a sacrament whereby the parties baptized are solemnly admitted into the visible Church, and enter into an open and professed engagement to be wholly and only the Lord's." And the proof-text cited for this point is 1 Cor. xii. 13: "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have all been made to drink into one Spirit."

This is in perfect accordance with the analogy of faith, the reason and fitness of things, the current language of inspiration, and the teaching of the great body of the Church in every age. Nearly all, ancients and moderns, speak of baptism—to use the phrase of St. Augustin—as *janua ecclesiae*, "the door of the Church," the ordinance by which we are introduced to the communion of saints.

So far as our children are concerned, it is of incalculable importance, as it is a formal and solemn recognition of their claims upon the care and oversight of the Church. It is the initiative of a course of ecclesiastical training and discipline by which

they are to be prepared, with the blessing and grace of God, for all the duties and responsibilities of the Christian life. It is not to be looked upon as an isolated act, but as the commencement of a religious career; a covenant transaction to be constantly reverted to in every stage of their progress, as it never loses its meaning, virtue, and use, as a sign and seal and means of grace.

It is no part of our present duty to enlarge upon the religious training to which the children of the Church should be subjected. It is obvious that a large portion of it devolves upon their domestic guardians, who are accordingly to be held accountable in the premises. The neglect of parental duty is a matter which comes legitimately under the disciplinary jurisdiction of the Church. Surely none can be acceptable members of the Church who do not

endeavor to bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.

But, in addition to the discipline thus brought to bear upon baptized children, there is a more direct ecclesiastical oversight to which they are entitled. The Church is bound to give all diligence to instruct them in the principles of religion, so that they may comprehend their baptismal obligations and be induced to discharge the same. In primitive times this was done in catechumenical schools, which are coeval with Christianity. Sunday-schools, duly recognized by the Church and faithfully supervised by its pastors, are admirably adapted to answer this good end.

The judicious observations of Dr. Dwight on this subject are worthy of special note. He says (Sermons clvii. and clxii.):

> That infants should be baptized and then be left by ministers and Churches in a situation undistinguishable from that of other children, appears to me irreconcilable with any scriptural view of the nature and importance of this sacrament.
>
> Ministers ought, in my view, to make it a business of their ministerial office distinctly to unfold to them the nature of their relation to God and his Church, and solemnly to enforce on them the duties arising from this relation—particularly the duties of repentance and faith in the Redeemer, of giving themselves up to God in his covenant, and taking upon themselves openly the character of Christians. This, I apprehend, should be done not only from the desk [pulpit], but in a regular course of laborious catechetical instruction. The same thing should be explicitly and solemnly enjoined from time to time upon their parents: one of whose first duties it is, in my apprehension, to co-operate faithfully with their ministers in teaching and enjoining these things upon their children. Were these things begun as soon as the children were capable of understanding them, and pursued through every succeeding period of their nonage, a fair prospect, as

it seems to me, would be opened for the vigorous growth and abundant fruitfulness of this nursery of the Church.

> Should baptized persons, with these advantages, conduct themselves frowardly in a course of open, obstinate iniquity, after they have come to years of discretion, the Church may, with the strictest propriety, shut them out from these privileges until by a penitent and becoming deportment they shall manifest their contrition for their guilty conduct—not however without previous and ample admonition.
>
> I will further suggest that, in my own view, it is a part of the duty of

each Church, at their meetings for evangelical conversation and prayer, to summon the baptized persons, who are minors, to be present at convenient seasons, while the Church offers up prayer to God peculiarly for them; and to pray for them particularly at other meetings holden for these purposes. Were all these things regularly and faithfully done (and they all seem to grow out of the circumstances of persons baptized in their infancy), I can not help believing that a new face would, in a great measure, be put upon the condition and character of the persons in question. It must be acknowledged that much less attention is paid to them in modern than in ancient times—at least by Churches in general—and less, I think, by ourselves than by our ancestors.

As the exclusion from baptism, of all children of non-communicants, though they may be nominal Christians, is considered a great hardship, and very demoralizing in its consequences, some Calvinists have introduced the law of *atavism*, by which law, if it can be shown that any one of the ancestors of a child was a Christian, the child is thereby entitled to baptism. By this charitable expedient almost all children in Christian countries may be admitted to the ordinance.

§ 6. Baptism a Sign of Regeneration.

The article proceeds to say that baptism "is also a sign of regeneration, or the new birth."

It is a source of great satisfaction that the compilers of the articles were led to use this language. Why did they not say that it is regeneration, or the new birth? Bishop Browne complains that

> It is difficult to find any exact model on which this article is formed. It bears little resemblance to any former article in any other Confession, either English or foreign. It is decidedly penned with considerable caution. It begins with a denial of the Zuinglian notion that "baptism is a mere sign of profession or mark of difference." It continues, that it is "a sign of regeneration, or new birth." So far, however, its statement is not much more than Zuinglius's.

But the Bishop takes comfort from the clauses which we have omitted. He thinks that they are nebulous and confused, but still may teach baptismal regeneration. "Whence the confusion sprung, if such it were," he somewhat confusedly adds, "it

may be hard to say. The Latin and English have both authority; but

one does not explain the other. Perhaps they rather supply than explain each other." With this "confusion" we have but little concern, as we are well rid of it.

The good bishop is evidently much dissatisfied with this article, as he has occasion to be. He says:

> It has been truly observed that the article which expressly treats of baptism speaks less distinctly than any other authorized document, and is more easily explained away. Why this should have been is not apparent. The primate and his coadjutor, Ridley, perpetually, both before and after the publication of the articles, expressed their own views in strong and unmistakable language. It is certain that the bishops and clergy in general were not more disposed to Zuinglian doctrines than the primate; but, on the contrary, were rather more favorable to Romanism and doctrines verging on Romanism. The article could not therefore have been softened to please them. It is not impossible that the king himself, young as he was, may have had some leaning to the Swiss Reformers, and that to please him, and perhaps to satisfy some foreign divines, a certain degree of ambiguity may have been allowed.

We suppose the bishop thought a poor apology better than none; but we can scarcely conceive of any weaker than this. Why should the king, young as he was, want the article softened, when the Office for Infant Baptism, put out nearly at the same time, and enjoined by the same authority, is *hard* enough for a Romanist. It affirms that every child baptized is in or by baptism spiritually regenerated. Here is the language: "This child is by baptism regenerated;" and, "we yield thee most hearty thanks, most merciful Father, that it hath pleased thee to regenerate this infant with thy Holy Spirit." Can language be more explicit, more unambiguous than this? Bishop Browne, in a most elaborate, historical argument, proves beyond all possibility of refutation that such was the belief of the Lutheran Reformers, and of the Anglican Reformers who copied after them, as they copied after the Fathers, who came nearer to a unanimous consent on this dogma, erroneous as it is, than on any other. It is true they all contradicted themselves: that was unavoidable; Romanists do that. They can not avoid speaking of baptism as "the outward and visible sign of the inward and spiritual grace," as well as "a means whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us thereof." It would seem that language can not more clearly show that the sign is one thing, and the thing signified another. Baptism is not that which it signifies, pledges, and assists us in realizing.

370

Now, we hold to the truth, and reject the error. We are not in a dilemma; we are not obliged to embrace Zuinglianism in order to avoid Romanism (for such is baptismal regeneration); we avoid both Scylla and Charybdis. We stand by our article. Baptism is not regeneration, in the sense in which we use that term in theology; but "it is the sign of regeneration, or the new birth."

The word, "regeneration," παλιγγενεσία, occurs but twice in the New Testament. Matt. xix. 28: "Verily, I say unto you, That ye which have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." The words, "in the regeneration," as indicated by the common punctuation, are to be joined with what follows. It means perhaps the new dispensation, which was fully inaugurated after our Lord's ascension, when he was seated on the mediatorial throne, and the apostles were invested with authority to govern the Church, the Israel of God, which dispensation is consummated at the resurrection and final judgment. The word here, course, has no relation to baptism.

But it has in the other place—Titus iii. 5, 6: "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost; which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour." Δουτρόν means "a bath, water for bathing—a bathing, washing, ablution." It is so used in Eph. v. 26. As the ancient *loutron* was not a bath in which to plunge, but a vessel in which the bather sat while an attendant poured water copiously on him, it well represents baptism, which, as Parkhurst says, was anciently administered by a copious pouring of water upon the head of the subject. Hence the apostle says, "which he shed on us abundantly," that is, "poured on us copiously," as the Spirit was poured upon the disciples on the Day of Pentecost, and so it would seem the water too, in baptism, by which the former was symbolized. The phrase therefore, "the washing of regeneration," denotes baptism, as it symbolizes the "renewing of the Holy Ghost." It here indicates the entrance on the new life, baptism being the rite of initiation. The converts from heathenism to whom

the apostle refers were baptized when they abandoned their old, impure mode of life, and entered upon a new and a holy life. The Jews called the ceremony by which proselytes were initiated into the Jewish Church "regeneration," a new birth, because it symbolized a new life. The Fathers used the word in the same sense of baptism: only, unfortunately, in their bombastic, rhetorical way of writing, they attached to the thing what they knew very well belonged to the thing signified. They speak of being born like "little fishes" in the water, like Christ the Ichthus, making a pun out of this title, the big fish, and all such puerile nonsense. But in their sober moments they speak very differently, and repudiate the notion that water can change the nature: nothing but the Holy Spirit can do that, and they frequently deny that his grace is tied to the ordinance, though when no obstacle is presented it may accompany it. This of course we admit, following them when they follow Scripture and reason, and leaving them when they run, as they so often do, into fanaticism and folly. Thus, whether "the washing of regeneration" denotes the new state into which men are brought when converted from heathenism to Christianity, or the new character being produced by "the renewing of the Holy Ghost," or whether the washing is symbolical of regeneration in the sense of inward, spiritual renewal, the passage proves nothing for the Romish notion of baptismal regeneration.

What is regeneration, as the term is used in theology and in this article? Here is how it is defined in the Catechism:

> *Q.* What is regeneration, or the new birth? *A.* It is that great change which God works in the soul when he raises it from the death of sin to the life of righteousness. It is the change wrought in the whole soul by the Almighty when it is created anew in Christ Jesus, when it is renewed after the image of God, in righteousness and true holiness.

The proof-texts adduced are these: 2 Cor. v. 17: "Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature; old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new." John iii. 3: "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." 2 Thess. ii. 12: "God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation, through sanctification of the Spirit."

Now we ask. Did any one ever know this great work wrought in the case of any infant in baptism? One can not ask this question without provoking a smile. Did any one ever know

this great work to be wrought in the case of any adult in baptism? We have seen many adults baptized, have baptized many with our own hands, and yet we have never seen a single instance of the kind. Charles Wesley does indeed speak of one. We have known many regenerated persons, have been with them when they experienced the great change from death unto life; but in most cases they had been baptized in their infancy, in some cases in mature years, sometimes not till after they had experienced this change, and, sad to say, we have known thousands who were baptized, but never regenerated, never made by this spiritual change new creatures in Christ Jesus. The Fathers generally, the Schoolmen, Romanists, Lutherans, and Anglicans to a great extent, hold that all are regenerated in baptism where no bar is interposed, which is never the case with infants. But we have seen that this is a great error.

Augustin is called by Bishop Browne "perhaps the greatest of uninspired divines"—a most unaccountable remark, as the works of Augustin are filled with puerilities, false expositions of Scripture, crude notions of philosophy, horrible as well as erroneous dogmas, and palpable contradictions. He is, indeed, entitled to no consideration in a question of this sort; it really matters not what stupid notions he entertained. But he is continually cited in discussions on this subject. What, then, did he hold? He held that all unbaptized infants, as well as unbaptized adults, who die, are damned. And he, forsooth, is the greatest of all uninspired divines. Why, such a hard father of infants, as he was called, would not be admitted to any evangelical pulpit in the world; he is held in execration by all mothers, as Coleridge, perhaps, says. We would not care to receive such a one into our house. He held, moreover, that all are regenerated in baptism, all are renewed by the Spirit, but only those predestinated to eternal life have inamissible grace vouchsafed to them. Both are alike regenerated; but the non-elect will fall away and perish, while the elect will persevere to the end, and be saved. Singular teaching for "the greatest of uninspired divines!" Is there a man living that entertains notions so absurd?

Calvin differed from his great master. He held that all are regenerated in baptism if they are of the elect, but not if they are of the reprobate: the latter, baptized or not baptized, dying

in infancy or in mature life, are never regenerated. All the elect are regenerated in baptism and have inamissible grace given to them, so that though they may sin in after life, they can never perish. Moreover, if any of the elect fail to receive baptism, they will be regenerated and saved without it.

Some of his followers, knowing that regeneration seldom takes place in baptism in the case of adults, and never in the case of infants, still speak of grace vouchsafed in baptism, as a "mere potential principle, dormant and inactive," which will be developed in after life by effectual calling whenever the Spirit pleaseth in the case of all the elect. It is strange that they do not see the incongruity, not to say sacrilege, of baptizing reprobates who have no part nor lot in the matter: they might as well baptize the devil as a reprobate for whom Christ never died, and who is therefore incapable of salvation. Yet they baptize all the children of believers, though they know that according to the "horrible decree" many of them are damned from their mother's womb.

Some say they baptize all children, though they believe that only the elect will be regenerated in baptism—perhaps not altogether even then, but only *potentially* regenerated in the sacrament—with a charitable hope that they are all *elect*. This can hardly be called self-delusion; they do not "charitably hope" any such thing. They know that many whom they baptize will grow up in sin, continue in sin, and be damned; and that, according to the decree of election and reprobation, it cannot be otherwise. On our principles there is no impropriety in baptizing all children, because all are alike entitled to baptism, and to all are promised the blessings which it symbolizes, while none are actually regenerated in the ordinance.

Some Anglicans, who repudiate predestination, and who cannot but admit that there is no perceptible difference between the children of pedobaptists and those of antipedobaptists, similarly circumstanced, think that they untie the knot by making regeneration a *spiritual* change, not a *moral* change. Thus the House of Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, who put forth this episcopal decision with apparent satisfaction and great confidence. But what is spiritual regeneration? If regeneration is not understood in the ritual sense, as a mere change of relation, initiation into the visible Church,

the being "born of water"—a meaning which the word will bear, but a sense in which it is not used in the article, which speaks of baptism as a *sign* of regeneration, not regeneration itself—then it must denote a moral change. Indeed, Bishop White, the father of the Protestant Episcopal Church, expressly says that regeneration, the new birth, in the formularies is to be understood in the sense we have assigned it. The phrases, "member of Christ," "child of God," and "inheritor of the kingdom of heaven," must be understood in the same sense as in the Scriptures. There can be but two senses, as the Church, the kingdom of God, must either be the outward and visible, or the inward and invisible. Baptism makes us Christians in the former sense; spiritual regeneration makes us Christians in the latter sense; and if this is not a moral change, what is it? It takes place in the realm of the soul—intellect, sensibilities, and will; it raises from the death of sin to the life of righteousness. "That which is born of the Spirit is spirit." "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is born of God. In this the children of God are manifest, and the children of the devil; whosoever doeth not righteousness is not of God." (1 John iii. 9, 10.) "Every one that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God." (1 John iv. 7.) "Whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world: and this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith." (1 John v. 4) This is spiritual regeneration; this is the new birth—the birth of the Spirit, of which the birth of water is the symbol. It is a pitiful trifling with the solemn subject to say that infants are spiritually regenerated, but not morally changed, in baptism.

The hopelessness of all explanation and defense of baptismal regeneration is nowhere so apparent as in the elaborate discussion of this article by Bishop Browne. It is humiliating to see learning and talent so prodigally wasted. He says:

> Though it be true that infants can, at the time of their baptism, oppose no obstacle lest they should receive pardon and grace; and though, therefore, in case of their death before actual sin, we believe in the certainty of their salvation; yet we must bear in mind that the pardon of sin and the aid of the Spirit assured (and therefore surely given) at baptism, will not have produced an entire change of their nature, eradicating the propensity to sin, and even creating a sanctified heart. The grace of the Spirit, we may believe, will, as the reason opens and the will develops, plead with their spirits, prompt them to good and warn them from

evil, and, if not resisted, will doubtless lead them daily onward in progressive holiness. But the power, too, to resist, which they did not possess in infancy, will daily increase with their increasing reason and activity, and their *actual and internal sanctification* will result only from an obedient yielding to the grace of the Sanctifier, and will be utterly abortive if, through sinful propensities and sinful indulgence of them, that grace be stifled, disregarded, or abused. Thus, though we may not define the grace of the Spirit vouchsafed in infant baptism to be a "mere potential principle," and, until it be stirred up, "dormant and inactive;" yet we may define it so as to understand that its active operations are only to be expected when the dawning reason and rising will themselves become active and intelligent; and that any thing like a real moral renovation of disposition and character can only be looked for where the adolescent will does not resist and quench the gracious influences of the Spirit of God, but suffers itself to be molded and quickened unto a state of subjection to the good pleasure of the Lord and of likeness to the character of Christ.

There is a jumble of contradictions and ambiguities worthy of "the greatest of uninspired divines." Augustin himself could scarcely exceed this. All baptized infants are "born of water and of the Spirit," but then they are only born of water, *not of the Spirit!* All baptized infants, as they lay no bar in the way, and all baptized adults who interpose no bar, experience "a death unto sin and a new birth unto righteousness:" they are "regenerated with the Holy Spirit." But then no infant is really thus regenerated or experiences this new birth, nor can he realize this "actual and internal sanctification" until "the adolescent will suffers itself to be molded and quickened into a state of subjection to the good pleasure of the Lord, and of likeness to the character of Christ," by "the gracious influences of the Spirit of God." These are palpable contradictions. As the common adage goes, he runs with the hare, and holds with the hound.

What the men of this school call the grace of baptism, imparted to infants, is what we call preventing grace, which is imparted to every child of man as soon as he comes into the world, baptized or not baptized. To this we are indebted for the susceptibility of good impressions; the capacity of choosing the good and refusing the evil as soon as our powers unfold; for all the pleasing, winning ways of infancy, which could have no existence if we did not come into the world on the basis of the atonement, sustaining a relation to the Second Adam as well as to the first, encompassed and influenced by

the Holy Spirit, who as a blessed atmosphere of spiritual life, as his name denotes,

surrounds us from our very birth, operating upon us by his gracious, mysterious power, fitting us for heaven if we die in infancy, or for a life of holiness on earth, if in after years we concur with his preventing, regenerating, and sanctifying grace.

That all this is signified in baptism we admit; for, as the article says, baptism is "the sign of regeneration," and therefore as all redeemed by Christ are through him entitled to the "thing signified," none of them should be excluded from the "thing signifying."

Baptism, as Augustin, Calvin, and others very well say, is performed once for all, but it lasts through life. It pledges God, it pledges us, for all time: the former to bestow all needful grace, the latter to use the grace so freely given. The privileges and obligations of baptism, therefore, are secured to us and bound upon us for our whole life, and are to be realized and discharged as soon and as long as we are capable of realizing and discharging them. In this light there is no difficulty whatever in such passages as John iii. 5; Titus iii. 5; Rom. vi. 3, 4. Paul says: "Know ye not that so many of us as are baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." Here the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ constitute the great archetype which we are to follow. As he died on the cross for sin, so we are to die to sin —which in Scripture style denotes separation from it; as he was buried in the tomb, so we are to be buried—as completely and obviously separated from sin as the corpse is separated from the world when it is laid in the grave; as Christ rose triumphant from the dead, so we are to be raised to newness of life. There is no necessity of pressing the metaphors any farther; this is their manifest import. All this is signified in baptism, which is furthermore "a means whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us thereof." Our baptism binds us to these moral changes, and by introducing us into the visible Church, and the use of all other means of grace, very materially promotes their realization. But, as we have shown, the great initial change which we call regeneration may be realized before baptism, as in the case of

Cornelius and his friends; or after baptism, as in the case of the pentecostal converts; or without baptism, as in the case of the thief on the cross, and thousands of other penitent believers who were never baptized.

§ 8. The Mode of Baptism.

The article says nothing directly about the mode of baptism, as the catholic Church (with the exception of a small fragment) recognizes the validity of baptism, whether the subject be applied to the water, as in immersion, or the water to the subject, as in sprinkling or affusion. But as baptism is a "sign of regeneration," which is metaphorically set forth as accomplished by pouring, sprinkling, and the like, the latter mode seems best adapted to the end in view. (*Cf.* Isa. xliv. 3; Ezek. xxxvi. 25, 26; Acts i.; ii.; x. 44–48; xi. 15, 18; *et al.*)

The word *βαπτίζω*, in Hellenistic Greek, denotes washing or purification, by whatever mode it is effected. Affusion seems preferable in baptism, as it best represents the thing signified, the outpouring of the Holy Spirit. It is more convenient and less hazardous than immersion; and it seems to have been the mode by which John the Baptist (as represented in pictures in the catacombs nearly or quite as ancient as the times of the apostles) and the apostles administered baptism. It is difficult to see how it could have been otherwise performed in the case of the multitudes that were baptized by John, and the three thousand baptized by the apostles on the Day of Pentecost; or Saul, or Lydia and the Philippian jailer, and their families; or even the Ethiopian eunuch, who seems to have been surprised to find any water in the desert. The prepositions rendered "into" and "out of" might have been better rendered *unto* and *from*, "They went down both *unto* the water, and came *up* from the water." It seems they stepped down from the chariot to a spring by the road-side, and Philip poured water upon his convert, thereby symbolizing and sealing the sanctifying grace of the Spirit, which was already poured out upon him. As in every other case, it was not "regeneration, or the new birth," but *a sign of it*, a *signum significans* and a *signum confirmans*, as it guarantees the sanctification which it represents.

[Dr. Summers is thus brief in his treatment of the mode of

baptism for several reasons: (1) because, as noted above, the topic is not directly introduced in the article; (2) because Methodism has produced an abundant literature on the subject, easily

accessible; and (3) because he himself has exhaustively discussed the question in his treatise on Baptism, chap, v., pp. 78–123, which the student will do well to consult. But in a work like the present, which aims at the completeness of systematic exposition, it seems desirable that the omission should be supplied. Accordingly there is appended so much of the excellent argument of Dr. Charles Hodge as is based upon the New Testament usage of *βάπτω* and *βαπτίζω* and their cognates. This is the more in place, as the bulky and costly "Systematic Theology" of Dr. Hodge is not likely to obtain an extensive circulation in other communions than his own. This learned Presbyterian divine says:

The word *βάπτειν* is used four times in the New Testament, in no one of which does it express the idea of entire immersion. In Luke xvi. 24, "That he may dip (*βάψῃ*) the tip of his finger in water." The finger, when dipped in water, is not submerged. When placed horizontally on the water, and slightly depressed, it retains more of the moisture than if plunged perpendicularly into it. John xiii. 26 speaks twice of dipping the sop (*βάψας* and *ἐμβάψας*). But a morsel held in the fingers is only partially immersed. In Rev. xix. 13 the words περιβεβλημένος ἱμάτιον *βεβαμμένον αἵματι* obviously mean "clothed with a vesture stained or dyed with blood." The allusion is probably to Isa. lxiii. 1 *ff.*: "Who is this that cometh from Edom, with dyed garments from Bozrah? . . . Wherefore art thou red in thine apparel, and thy garments like him that treadeth in the wine-fat? I have trodden the wine-press alone; . . . and their blood shall be sprinkled upon my garments, and I will stain all my raiment." In this case, therefore, the baptism was by sprinkling. Βαπτίζω occurs in the New Testament about eighty times, *βάπτισμα* some twenty times, and *βαπτιμος* four times.

As every one admits that baptism may be effected by immersion, and as the purifications under the Old Testament (called by the Apostle, Heb. ix. 10, in Greek, "diverse baptisms") were effected by immersion, affusion, and sprinkling, it would not be surprising if in some of these numerous passages the baptism spoken of necessarily implied immersion. It so happens, or it has been so ordered however, that there is no such passage in the whole of the New Testament. The places in which these words occur may be arranged in the following classes: (1) Those in which, taken by themselves, the presumption is in favor of immersion; (2) those in which the idea of immersion is necessarily excluded; (3) those which in themselves are not decisive, but where the presumption is altogether in

favor of affusion.

1. To the first class belong those passages which speak of the persons baptized going into (εἰς) the water, and "coming up out of the water." (Matt. iii. 16; Acts viii. 38, 39.) Such passages, however, must be isolated in order to create a presumption in favor of immersion. According to ancient accounts, the common way of baptizing was for the person to step into water, when water was poured on his head, and then he came up out of the water, not in the least incommoded by dripping garments. And when we remember that it is said concerning John,

that "there went out to him Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan, and were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins" (Matt. iii. 5, 6), it seems physically impossible that he should have immersed all this multitude. When all the circumstances are taken into view, the presumption in favor of immersion, even in this class of passages, disappears.

2. The second class of passages, those from which the idea of immersion is excluded, includes all those which relate to the baptism of the Spirit. The Spirit is frequently said to be poured out on men; but men are never said to be dipped or immersed into the Holy Spirit. Such an idea is altogether incongruous. When, therefore, it is said that men are baptized by the Holy Spirit, as is so often done, the reference must be to effusion, or affusion of the Spirit by which the soul is cleansed from sin. As the Holy Spirit is a person, and not a mere influence or force, the preposition ἐν used in this connection (Matt. iii. 11; Mark i. 8; John i. 33; Acts i. 5; xi. 16; 1 Cor. xii. 13) must have its instrumental force. The work performed in us by the Holy Spirit is a baptism. As water in the hands of John was the purifying medium for the body, so the Holy Spirit, as sent or given by Jesus Christ, purifies the soul. Some of the modern commentators are such purists that they are unwilling to allow of the slightest departure from classic usage in the Greek of the New Testament. They speak as though the sacred writers were Greek grammarians, instead of, as was in most cases the fact, unlettered men writing in what to them was a foreign language. Thus, because the particle ἵνα in classic Greek has always a telic force, they deny that it is ever used ecbatically in the New Testament, even in such cases as Luke xxii. 30: "I appoint unto you a kingdom, . . . *in order that* ye may eat and drink at my table." John vi. 7: "Two hundred pennyworth of bread is not sufficient for them, *in order that* every one of them may have a little." Rom. xi. 11: "Have they stumbled *with the design that* they should fall?" 1 Cor. xiv. 13: "Let him that speaketh in an unknown tongue pray *in order that* he may interpret," etc. Thus, also, because the words πιστεύω, πίστις, and πιστός in the classics are rarely found in construction with the preposition they give the most unnatural interpretation to many passages in order to avoid admitting that construction in the New Testament. This is

done in the face of such passages as Mark i. 15, πιστεύετε ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ. Gal. iii. 26: "Ye are all the children of God, διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ." Eph. i. 15: "After I heard of your πίστιν ἐν τῷ Κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ," and many others of like kind. In like manner, because the instrumental force of ἐν is rare in the classics, it is avoided as much as possible in the Scripture. Baptism ἐν πνεύ*κματι*, instead of being understood as meaning a baptism by or with the Spirit, is made to mean "in the sphere of the Spirit," and baptism ἐν πυρί, baptism "in the sphere of fire." What this means it would be difficult for most of those for whom the Bible is intended to understand. The baptism of John and that of Christ are contrasted. The one baptized with water; the other with the Holy Spirit. In Acts i. 5 it is said, "John truly baptized with water (ὕ*δατι*, the simple instrumental dative); but ye shall be baptized (ἐν Πνεύ*ματι* Ἁγίῳ) with the Holy Ghost not many days hence." As to baptize ὕ*δατι* cannot mean to immerse in water, so neither can baptizing ἐν Πνεύ*ματι* Ἁγίῳ mean immersing in the Spirit. The fact is *βαπτίζειν* does not express any particular mode of action. As "to dye" expresses any kind of action by which an object is colored; to bury, any kind of action by which an object is hidden and protected; so to baptize expresses any act by which a person

or thing is brought into the state of being wet, purified, or even stupefied, as by opium or wine.

Another passage in which this word occurs, where the idea of immersion is precluded, is 1 Cor. x. 1, 2: "All our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." The people went through the sea dry shod. As far as known not a drop of water touched them. The cloud referred to was doubtless the pillar of cloud by day and the pillar of fire by night which guided the people through the wilderness. The simple and generally accepted meaning of the passage is, that as a man is brought by Christian baptism into the number of the professed and avowed disciples of Christ, so the Hebrews were brought by the supernatural manifestations of divine power specified into the relation of disciples and followers of Moses. There is no allusion to immersion, affusion, or sprinkling in the case.

Another passage belonging to this class is Mark vii. 4: "When they come from the market, except they wash (*βαπτίσωνται*), they eat not. And many other things there be, which they have received to hold, as the washing of cups, and pots, brazen vessels, and of tables (κλινῶν, couches)." To maintain that beds or couches were immersed is a mere act of desperation.[5] Baptism means here, as it does everywhere when used of a religious rite, symbolical purification by water, without the slightest reference to the mode in which that purification was effected.

3. The third class of passages includes all those in which the idea of immersion, though not absolutely precluded, is to the last degree

improbable. The late Dr. Edward Robinson, than whom there is no higher authority on all that relates to the topography and physical geography of Palestine and the habits of its inhabitants, so far as they are determined by the nature of the country, says: (1) “The idea of private baths in families in Jerusalem and Palestine generally is excluded.” (2) “In Acts ii. 41 three thousand persons are said to have been baptized at Jerusalem apparently in one day at the season of Pentecost in June; and in Acts iv. 4 the same rite is necessarily implied in respect to five thousand more. Against the idea of full immersion in these cases there lies a difficulty, apparently insuperable, in the scarcity of water. There is in summer no running stream in the vicinity of Jerusalem, except the mere rill of Siloam a few rods in length; and the city is and was supplied with water from its cisterns and public reservoirs. From neither of these sources could a supply have been well obtained for the immersion of eight thousand persons. The same scarcity of water forbade the use of private baths as a general custom; and thus also further precludes the idea of bathing” in such passages as Luke xi. 38; Mark vii. 2–8. He confirms his conclusion by further remarking, (3) “In the earliest Latin versions of the New Testament, as, for example, the Itala, which Augustin regarded as the best

of all, which goes back apparently to the second century and to usage connected with the apostolic age, the Greek verb, *βαπτίζω* is uniformly given in the Latin form, ‘baptizo,’ and is never translated by ‘immergo,’ or any like word, showing that there was something in the rite of baptism to which the latter did not correspond.” (4) “The baptismal fonts still found among the ruins of the most ancient Greek churches in Palestine, as at Tekoa and Gophna, and going back apparently to very early times, are not large enough to admit of the baptism of adult persons by immersion, and were obviously never intended for that use.”

It is, therefore, to the last degree improbable that the thousands mentioned in the early chapters of Acts were baptized by immersion. The same improbability exists as to the case of the centurion in Caesarea and the jailer at Philippi. With regard to the former, Peter said, “Can any man forbid water?” which naturally implies that the water was to be brought to Cornelius, and not he be taken to the water. As to the jailer, it is said (Acts xvi. 33) that he and all his were baptized within the prison, as the narrative clearly implies, at midnight. There is the same improbability against the assumption that the eunuch, mentioned in Acts viii. 27–38, was immersed. He was traveling through a desert part of the country toward Gaza, when Philip joined him, “And as they went on their way they came unto a certain water (ἐπί τι ὕδωρ, to some water).” There is no known stream in that region of sufficient depth to allow of the immersion of a man. It is possible, indeed, that there might have been a reservoir or tank in that neighborhood. But that is not a fact to be assumed without evidence and

against probability. It is said they "went down both into the water," and came "up out of the water." But that might be said, if the water were not deep enough to cover their ankles.

The presumption is still stronger against immersion in the case mentioned in Mark vii. 4. It is there said of "the Pharisees and all the Jews," that "when they come from the market, except they baptize themselves (ἐὰν μὴ βαπτίσωνται) they eat not." Let it be here considered: (1) That private baths were in Jerusalem very rare, from the necessity of the case. (2) That what is said is not said merely of men of wealth and rank who might be supposed to have conveniences and luxuries which the common people could not command. It is said of the "Pharisees," a large class, and not only of that class, but of "all the Jews." It is well-nigh incredible, under such circumstances, that "all the Jews" should immerse themselves every time they come from the ἀγορά—*i. e.*, "a place of public resort in towns and cities; any open place where the people came together either for business or to sit and converse. In Oriental cities such open places were at the inside of the gates; and here public business was transacted, and tribunals held, as also markets." That all the Jews immersed themselves every time they came from such a place of public resort is very hard to believe, considering that the facilities for such immersion were not at their command. (3) The words baptize and wash are interchanged in this whole connection in such a way as to show that, in the mind of the writer, they were synonymous expressions. The Pharisees complained that the disciples ate with unwashen (ἀνίπτοις) hands; for they eat not unless they wash (νίψωνται) their hands; and when they come from the market they do not eat unless they wash (βαπτίσωνται); ad they hold to the washing (βαπτισμούς) of cups, and pots, of brazen vessels, and of tables or couches.

382

To baptize the hands was to wash the hands, and the usual mode of ablution in the East is by pouring water on the hands (see 2 King. iii. 11).[6]

It is notorious that the various ablutions prescribed by the Mosaic law were

383

effected sometimes by immersion, sometimes by affusion, and sometimes by sprinkling. And it is no less true that all these modes of purification are called by the sacred writers διάφοροι βαπτισμοί, as in Heb. ix. 10 and Mark vii. 4.

So far, therefore, as the New Testament is concerned, there is not a single case where baptism necessarily implies immersion; there are many cases in which that meaning is entirely inadmissible, and many more in which it is in the highest degree

improbable. If immersion were indispensable, why was not the word *καταδύω* used to express the command? If sprinkling were exclusively intended, why was not *ῥαίνω* or *ῥαντίζω* used? It is simply because the mode is nothing and the idea every thing, that a word was chosen which includes all the modes in which water can be applied as the means of purification. Such a word is *βαπτίζω*, for which there is no legitimate substitute, and therefore that word has been retained by all the Churches of Christendom, even by the Baptists themselves.[7]]

---

1. It has been questioned whether *ἐπερώτημα* ever means "answer" or "stipulation," because its primary meaning is "questioning," "asking." Parkhurst says: "It is highly probable that the apostle alludes to the questions and answers which, we learn from Tertullian, were used at baptism. The bishop asked, *Dost thou renounce Satan? Dost thou believe in Christ?* The person to be baptized answered, *I renounce; I believe.* Thus Tertullian ('De Baptismo,' cap. 18) calls *sponsionem salutis* an engagement of salvation; and ('De Resurrect.,' cap. 48), referring no doubt to the above text in St. Peter, he says: 'The soul is consecrated (*sancitur*) not by washing, but by answering (*responsione*). To confirm the interpretation of *ἐπερώτημα*, here assigned, we may add the observations of Grotius that *ἐπερώτημα* is a *judicial term*, used by the Greek expounders of the Roman law, and that in the glossary *ἐπερωτῶ* is interpreted by *stipulor*, which signifies, primarily, *to ask and demand such and such a tines for a thing to be given, or done, by the ordinary words of the law.* But by a metonomy, adds Grotius, which is very common in the law, under the name of a *stipulation*, is comprehended also the *answer*, or *promise*; for in the same glossary *ἐπερωτώμαι* signified *to promise, engage.* Agreeably hereto Mill cites a gloss on the old law, published by Labbé, which explains *ἐπερώτησις* by *ὁμολογία*: *A promise, an agreement in words, by which any one answers to a question, that he will do or give some thing.*'" When such a response, or stipulation, is made with a good conscience, *bona fide*, depending on a risen and exalted Saviour, according to the next clause, that saves us. ↩
2. On Good-Friday, 1852, the Rev. R. Herschel baptized a Russian Jew in Trinity Chapel, London, in the usual form, adding: "We admit you, not as a member of any particular sect, but as a member of Christ's Church." Mr. Jansen, the party baptized, was thus made a member of the catholic Church, but not of any particular Church—the minister baptizing him being employed by a society consisting of

persons belonging to various particular Churches. “All the apostles and ministers of religion were commanded to baptize in water, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; and this was an admission to Christianity, not to any sect of it.” See Jer. Taylor’s “Dissuasive from Popery,” p. ii., b. i., sec. iii.↩

3. Thus Parreus, speaking of infants who die before performing any act, says: “They will, like others, be saved merely according to grace, or damned according to nature as children of wrath.” And Peter Martyr: “I dare not affirm that any dying without baptism will obtain salvation. For there are some children of holy persons who are not of the elect: *Ideo nemini sic [sine baptismo] decedenti ausim peculiariter promittere certam salutem. Sunt enim aliqui sanctorum filii, qui ad proedestinationem non pertinent.” Loc. Com.* So also Perkins: “There are many infants of pious parents who, dying before they have the use of reason, will nevertheless, on account of original sin, be damned: *Multi sunt piorum infantes, ante ullum rationis usum morientes, tamen originalis illa peccati labes hominibus damnandis suffecerit.*”↩
4. An account of the manner in which the Romans consecrated their children to their gods is given by Tertullian in his Treatise, *De Anima*, c. xxxvii., xxxix.—not *De Carne Christi*, as quoted by mistake in Dr. Clarke’s commentary on 1 Cor. vii. 14, where there is a translation of the passage.↩
5. It should be noted, however, that καὶ κλινῶν is omitted by Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort, and the Revised Version, though it is retained by Tregelles, Weiss, and in the margin of the Revised Version. It is a little singular that a single verse, Mark vii. 4, should contain two various readings both of which have a material bearing on the controversy about the mode of baptism. These “tables” or “couches,” which have done yeoman service in many a debate, will have to be given up. The copyists of New Testament MSS., however, were impartial in their distribution of favors to this generation, and the other variation points strongly in the other direction. This will be considered in a subsequent note—T.↩
6. There is a remarkable and, as regards the baptismal controversy, extremely important various reading in Mark vii. 4. The text critics have simply noted it, with the authorities on which it rests, while the commentators generally seem to have overlooked it, and nobody, apparently, has attached any importance to it. Even Westcott and Hort, who incorporate the new—or rather the old—reading in their text, give no discussion of it. Dr. Hodge above, and theological writers generally, appear to be ignorant of the existence of the various reading in question. Instead of the common reading *βαπτίσωνται*, both of the fourth century Uncial MSS., *Sinaiticus* and

Vaticanus (the oldest extant MSS. of the New Testament), followed by some cursives of no great importance, read ῥαντίσωνται. The authority for this latter reading is sufficient to induce its adoption by Volkmar, and also by Weiss, who uses it in his edition of Meyer, that greatest of New Testament commentators having failed to take any notice of the variation. As already noted, Westcott and Hort, doubtless the greatest authorities in England on questions of this nature, insert ῥαντίσωνται as the correct reading in their critical edition of the New Testament; and the Reviseded Version, after translating "except they wash themselves," adds in the margin, "Some ancient authorities read *sprinkle themselves.*" If this reading be received as correct, and the authority for it, as shown above, is by no means insignificant, we should have to read instead of "except they baptize themselves" (which is the literal rendering of the common text) as follows, "except they sprinkle themselves." Moreover the verb νίψωνται closely precedes to express the action of washing the hands; and the actions indicated both by this verb and by ῥαντίσωνται are virtually classed by Mark as "baptisms" when he goes on to say that the Pharisees and Jews practice many other "baptisms" (*βαπτίσμ*ούς, in our versions, both Authorized and Revised, translated washings). Thus *βαπτίσμ*ός is a term sufficiently wide to include, not only the action expressed by the cognate verb*βαπτίσωνται*, but also the actions expressed by the verbs νίψωνται and ῥαντίσωνται. Therefore, if ῥαντίσωνται be the correct reading, we have, in the original Scriptures, as they left the hand of the writers, a distinct and quite unmistakable recognition of sprinkling as baptism. This is perhaps as near an approximation to demonstration as we can hope to reach in questions of this sort, and, if the amended reading be accepted as genuine, the passage ought to prove the end of controversy.

But even if this most ancient reading be rejected the various reading is in evidence that in the middle of the fourth century *βαπτίζω* and ῥαντίζω were synonymous, or capable of being used interchangeably in many connections. There are three supposable cases, any one of which will account for the origin of the various reading if it be rejected as spurions. (1) The copyist who wrote the Codex Sinaiticus may have been led to substitute "sprinkle" for "baptize," through their similarity either of sound or of form in the Greek. This could hardly have taken place unless the words covered common ground, and particularly were capable of being used interchangeably in the context of Mark vii. 4. (2) It is possible that the copyist, on grounds satisfactory to himself, may have taken the responsilnlity of substituting "sprinkle" for "baptize" in the text. In this case, it would seem that he could hardly have regarded the

words as differing widely in meaning. (3) An earlier copyist may have put “sprinkle” in the margin as an explanation of “baptize” in the text, and the copyist who wrote the Sinaitic MS., mistaking the explanatory gloss for a correction of the text, may have substituted the marginal reading for the text before him. In this case we have written evidence that before the middle of the fourth century “baptize” and “sprinkle” were regarded as synonymous.

It may be worthy of remark that ῥαντίζω occurs four times in the New Testament: Heb. ix. 13, 19, 21 and x. 22. In every case it is translated *sprinkle*. This, it would seem, was the usual method of performing the Levitical baptisms.

The conclusion of the foregoing discussion is this: (1) If the reading ῥαντίσωνται be the correct one, and text critics of the highest ability and authority adopt it, this passage, it would appear, ought to be decisive of the controversy on the mode of baptism. (2) If the reading be spurious, the weight of evidence derivable from it, which is very considerable, is on the side of those who regard baptism as validly performed by affusion or sprinkling.—T.↩

7. “Systematic Theology,” Vol. III., pp. 531–536.↩

Chapter II.
Infant Baptism.

§ 1. Introductory.

384

The article closes with this sentence: “The baptism of young children is to be retained in the Church.” This statement is remarkable for its conciseness, simplicity, and suggestiveness.

There was no need for the pleonastic clause in the original article, “in any wise,” *omnino*; nor for the adjunct, “as most agreeable to the institution of Christ.” It should indeed, by all means, be retained in the Church, and for the reason that it is “most agreeable to the institution of Christ.” But there are other reasons for its retention.

It should be retained because it is in the Church, and has always been there. Dr. Wall says that Peter of Bruys, a Frenchman who flourished about the beginning of the twelfth century, whose followers were called Petrobrusians, was the first Antipedobaptist teacher who had a regular congregation. But Mr. Faber shows good reasons for doubting the statement that they rejected infant baptism. (See “Summers on Baptism,” page 40.) The Anabaptists in Germany arose about the time of the Reformation. It does not appear that there was any congregation of Anabaptists in England till the year 1640. The Antipedobaptists claim that the Waldenses repudiated infant baptism; but the Waldensian confessions, histories, and traditions directly disprove the assertion.

§ 2. Scriptural Proofs of Infant Baptism.

That “the baptism of young children” was practiced by the Church from the beginning is easily shown. It is not said, indeed, in so many words in the New Testament that the apostles baptized young children. There was no occasion to say this any more than there was occasion to say that they administered the Lord’s-supper to women. But both are implied in what is said.

When the apostle baptized Stephanas and Lydia he baptized also their families. The term οἶκος means *family*, as distinct

from οἰκία, *household*. It is so rendered by Bloomfield, in 1 Cor. i. 16, who cites a passage from Ignatius, in which the term is used in that sense, as under it the wife and children are specifically embraced. The apostle notes the distinction between these two terms. Thus he baptized the *oikos*, the *family*, of Stephanas; but he speaks of the *oikia*, the *household* of Stephanas, as addicting themselves to the ministry of the saints, that is, performing the duties of hospitality toward them. Such services would not, of course, be restricted to Stephanas, with his wife and children, the *oikos* of Stephanas, but would be rendered also by the servants of the family, in which case the word *oikia* is proper to be used, and it is used accordingly. (1 Cor. xvi. 15.)

This plain view of the subject explodes the notion that all the members of the family of Stephanas baptized by St. Paul must have been adults, because, forsooth, six or eight years afterward, they are spoken of as addicted to the ministry of the saints. It is not said that this service was rendered by the *oikos*, the *family*, of Stephanas; nor is it said that the *oikia*, the *household* of Stephanas was baptized by the apostle. This distinction ought to be noted in the translation. In like manner, it was not the *oikia*, the *household* of Lydia, but her *oikos*, her *family*, that was baptized; and this embraced only her children. It is preposterous to say that her *oikos* was her "journeymen dyers," and that they were "the brethren" spoken of (Acts xvi. 40), whom Paul and Silas comforted after their imprisonment! Nay, these brethren were neither servants nor sons of Lydia: they were probably no other than Luke and Timothy, who sojourned at Lydia's house during the imprisonment of Paul and Silas, and who were left by them at Philippi. (*Cf.* Acts xx. 6.)

When the Philippian jailer was baptized, "all his" were baptized with him. This was exactly in accordance with the Jewish custom. When they received proselytes by circumcision they administered the rite of initiation to the male children of the family; and in their proselyte baptisms they included the children with their believing parents. This is a dictate of nature, as well as a provision of the old dispensation. It is very bold to say that there were no infants in any of the numerous families that were baptized by the apostles. The families baptized were more likely to

comprehend children than adults, for the latter would not have been baptized except on their personal profession

of faith, whereas the children would be baptized on the responsibility of their parents. Hence the frequency of family baptisms.

This was the apostolic rule, as it is that of modern missionaries among the heathen. The apostles would very naturally so construe the Saviour's command: "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." (Mat. xxviii. 19, 20.) Suppose a similar command had been given in reference to the Jewish religion, how would it have been understood? Teach all nations—or rather, *μαθητεύσατε*, proselyte, make disciples of all nations—circumcising them and instructing them in the Hebrew faith. Would the rite have been restricted to adults, on the ground that children are not specified? Rather, would it not have been extended to children, on the ground that they are not excluded? And is not this the most obvious way to accomplish the end in view? If we pledge our children to Christianity from their very birth, by bringing them under the bond of the covenant, and teach them the Saviour's commands as soon as they can lisp his name, will they not be more likely to become his disciples than if they are abandoned as profane persons, unfit for a name and a place among his followers? The idea of such abandonment is repulsive to our natural sentiments, and utterly contrary to the genius of our benevolent and holy religion.

§ 3. Testimony of Antiquity.

The fathers claimed apostolical authority for the baptism of infants, and baptized them accordingly.

Justin Martyr, who wrote about forty years after the death of St. John, says: "Many persons among us, sixty or seventy years old, of both sexes, who were made disciples to Christ in their infancy, *ἐκ παίδων*, continue uncorrupted." He uses the very term which our Lord uses in Matt. xxviii. 19—*ἐμαθητεύθησαν* and as there is no other way to make infants disciples of Christ but by baptism, which Justin expressly calls "the circumcision of Christ," and as those of

whom he speaks were baptized, A.D. 70 or 80, they were baptized by the apostles, or by their contemporaries. In "Questions and Answers to the Orthodox," ascribed to Justin, occurs this passage, in keeping with the foregoing:

387

"The children—τὰ Βρέφη—of the good are deemed worthy of baptism, through the faith of those who bring them to be baptized."

To the same effect is the testimony of Irenaeus, Bishop of Lyons and disciple of Polycarp, who was intimately acquainted with St. John. Irenaeus was born about the time of the death of that apostle. He says: "Christ came to save all persons by himself—all, I say, who by him are born again to God—infants and little ones, and children, and youths, and elder persons—*renascuntur in Deum: infantes, et parvulos, et pueros, et juvenes, et seniores.*" We scarcely need state that the Fathers constantly spoke of baptism as *regeneration*, or at least included the former in their idea of the latter. Irenaeus himself says: "When Christ gave to his apostles the commission of regenerating unto God—*regenerationis in Deum*—he said to them: 'Go and teach all nations, *baptizing* them.'" Yet he affirms that children of all ages were regenerated or baptized.

Tertullian was born about sixty years after the death of St. John. Embracing the strange notion that baptism washes away all previous sins, this learned but visionary Father recommended a deviation from the established practice of the Church by a delay of baptism, unless the life of the child were in danger. He says: "According to every one's condition and disposition, and also their age, the delaying of baptism is more profitable, especially in the case of little children." For reasons equally valid, he says, unmarried persons, who are likely to be visited with temptation—both those who were never married and those who are in a widowed state—and other persons occupied with the cares of life, ought to defer their baptism. He adduces a variety of arguments, sufficiently silly, to induce the postponement of baptism in the case of infants;[1] but the one great conclusive argument

388

he does not so much as insinuate—to wit, that infant baptism was a novelty in the Church and had not been practiced by the apostles. There is but one way to account for this omission: Tertullian could not deny a fact with which everybody was acquainted. Indeed,

notwithstanding his opposition to infant baptism on the grounds specified, he never questioned the right of infants to the ordinance, but allowed them to be baptised when their lives were in danger, and that too by a layman when a minister could not be procured. It should be remarked, moreover, that his recommendation of delay in ordinary cases was not universally respected, nor permanently followed, though for a century or two it wrought considerable mischief in the Church. His novel and superstitious speculations, however, afford triumphant proof of the apostolic practice of infant baptism.

Origen was born at Alexandria, A.D. 185. His father, grandfather, and great-grandfather were Christians; it is likely the Origen family was brought into the Church by St. Mark, and the elder branches were for many years contemporary with the "faithful men" whom that evangelist placed over the Alexandrian Church. Origen himself was a very learned man, and he had lived in Greece, Rome, Cappadocia, and Arabia, and for a long time in Syria and Palestine. Surely if any one knew what was apostolic doctrine on this subject, Origen must have known. Yet he says expressly, speaking of original sin: "For this cause the Church received from the apostles an order to give baptism even to infants: *Pro hoc ecclesia ab apostolis traditionem suscepit etiam parvulis baptismum dare.*" He adds: "For they to whom the divine masteries were committed knew that there is in all persons the natural pollution of sin, which must be done away by water and the Spirit." The force of this testimony is seen in the attempts of Antipedobaptists to evade it on the ground that it occurs in a Latin translation by Rufinus, who may have manufactured the passage. A bright idea! Rufinus, who had secret doubts on the subject of original sin, foisted into Origen's work the strongest argument in its favor! What Rufinus did for Origen in translating his Commentary on Romans we suppose Jerome did in translating his Homily on Luke, though that

learned father protests he "changed nothing, but expressed every thing as it was in the original." In this Homily Origen says: "Infants are baptized for the remission of sins. And because by the sacrament of baptism our native pollution is taken away, therefore infants may be baptized." He uses this argument for original sin, in his Homily on Leviticus: "Baptism is given to infants, according to the practice of the Church, when, if there were nothing in infants

that needed forgiveness and mercy, the grace of baptism would be superfluous to them." In another place he propounds a question concerning the guardian angels of children: "When were the angels appointed to them? at their birth or at their baptism?" These, of course, are all very bad translations; so bad, that if they be permitted to pass; and Origen be considered a competent witness in regard to a plain matter of fact, the conclusion is certain: the apostles and their successors baptized infants.

In the year 253 a Council of Bishops was held in Carthage. This assembly was called upon by Fidus, a country bishop, to decide whether or not infants might be baptized before they were eight days old. The sentence of the Council was communicated to Fidus by Cyprian. He says:

> Whereas you judge that the rule of circumcision is to be observed so that none should be baptized and sanctified before the eighth day after he is born, we are all in our assembly of a contrary opinion. It is not for us to hinder any person from baptism and the grace of God, who is merciful, and kind, and affectionate to all; which rule, as it is to govern universally, so we think it more especially to be observed in reference to infants and persons newly born.

It seems the *quasi* antipedobaptism of Tertullian had but little influence with the Council, the members of which, sixty-six in number, must have known what was the practice of the apostles, as they lived so near their times.

Gregory Nazianzen, styled the Christian Isocrates, because of his eloquence, was born A.D. 330. He opposed the postponement of baptism, and urged the administration of the ordinance to infants. "For," says he, "it is better they be sanctified without their own sense of it than that they should be unsealed and uninitiated, and our reason for this is circumcision, which was performed on the eighth day, and was a typical seal, and was practiced on those who had no reason." Unless there was danger, however, he recommended the postponement of their baptism until they were three years old. Gregory, by the way,

speaks with commendation of the baptism of Basil in his infancy.

Ambrose speaks of the baptism of infants, and refers the custom to the apostles' times. Chrysostom also speaks of baptism as Christian circumcision, and as conferred on infants. So also does Jerome, and indeed nearly all the Fathers of that age; but it is

useless to give additional citations.

§ 4. Proof Afforded by the Pelagian Controversy.

We must not, however, pass over the proof of the apostolic, or rather divine, origin of baptism which is furnished in the Pelagian controversy. By a singular coincidence, Pelagius and his illustrious opponent were born on the same day, Nov. 13, 354. Pelagius, having denied original sin, was pressed by his antagonists with the argument in favor of that doctrine based upon the baptism of infants. Augustin says:

> The whole Church has of old constantly held that baptized infants do obtain remission of original sin by the baptism of Christ. For my part, I do not remember that I ever heard any other thing from any Christians that received the Old and New Testaments, neither from such as were in the Catholic Church, nor yet from such as belonged to any sect or schism. I do not remember that I ever read otherwise, in any writer that I could ever find treating of these matters, that followed the canonical Scriptures, or did mean or pretend so to do.

Pelagius, in defending himself in his letter to Innocent, says: "Men slander me as if I denied the sacrament of baptism to infants. I never heard even an impious heretic say they ought not to be baptized. For who is so ignorant of the evangelical writings as to have such a thought? Who can be so impious as to hinder infants from being baptized?"

His friend Celestius affirms: "We acknowledge infants ought to be baptized for the remission of sins, according to the rule of the universal Church, and according to the sentence of the gospel."

These men, be it remembered, were the most learned men of the age. Pelagius was born in Britain and educated at the celebrated seminary at Bangor, and he afterward traveled through the principal countries of Europe, Asia, and Africa. So also did Celestius; and yet they declared that they never heard of any one that denied the right of infants to baptism. They would gladly have denied it, had there been any possibility of doing so, as it constituted the basis of a formidable argument against their peculiar notions; but there was the stubborn fact, known

and read of all men, and the Pelagians could not deny it. Yet if

infant baptism had been foisted into the Church after the death of the apostles, they could not have been ignorant of it. The novelty, like the paschal, prelatical, and pontifical innovations, would have occasioned some controversy, and the time of its introduction would certainly have been known by somebody in the first two centuries after the apostles. But not the slightest difference on the subject of infant baptism—except the vagary of Tertullian—is noted in any of the writings of the Fathers; though every variation from apostolic rule is set down in the list of heresies compiled by Irenaeus, Epiphanius, Philastrius, Augustin, and Theodoret.

§ 5. Protestant Use of Patristic Testimony.

Let it be observed, we do not adduce "the unanimous consent of the Fathers," as authority for the practice of infant baptism, as "we have a more sure word of prophecy;" nor do we indorse their opinions concerning the virtue of baptism; we have nothing to do with their illogical arguments or their erratic speculations. We cite the Fathers as witnesses to a fact, concerning which they were every way competent to give testimony. That testimony absolutely demonstrates the apostolic, or rather divine, origin of infant baptism.

As young children had always been admitted to the Church by baptism, it was as little as the Reformers could say that the custom should be retained in the Church. What right had they to discontinue this practice? Suppose they could not give any other reason for it than that it is "most agreeable with the institution of Christ," would not that suffice? Suppose they could not discern the congruity with Christ's institution, that would not affect their duty. They found infant baptism where the apostles left it, and where the Fathers and their successors retained it; and it was enough for them to say "it is to be retained in the Church," and to practice it accordingly, which they did without any dissent, except by the Anabaptists, and the Quakers who came after them, who went further than they, as they neither retained the baptism of young children nor of adults. But that young children are the proper subjects of baptism has been often shown by numerous considerations, which we shall proceed to discuss in detail.

392

They are all the subjects of redeeming grace, and they do not place any bar to the blood-bought privileges of the gospel to exclude themselves from participation in them.

They are not baptized because their parents are believers in Christ. Their right to the ordinance is of a higher investiture. They claim by a nobler entail. Dying in infancy, they enter heaven, not on the ground of their Christian descent—the piety of their parents—but because of their personal connection with the Second Adam, by whose righteousness the free gift is come upon them unto justification of life. Upon the very same basis are they admitted to membership in the kingdom of grace and to baptism, as the rite of initiation into the Church of God. If there be any for whom Christ did not die; any for whom he did not purchase the sanctifying grace of the Holy Ghost; any whom he designed and decreed never to save: such are obviously ineligible to baptism, which is the exponent of those great benefits that flow from the redemption that is in Christ Jesus. But if he tasted death for every man; if the free gift has come upon *all* who are involved in the condemnation of the pristine offense: there can be no reason to justify the exclusion of any from the sign and seal of the divine mercy, except such as exclude themselves by their obstinate impenitency, and infants are not of that number.

§ 7. Infants Embraced in the Gospel Covenant.

They are specifically embraced in the gospel covenant.

When that covenant was made with Abraham, his children were brought under its provisions, and the same seal that was administered to him was administered also to them; including both those that were born in his house and those that were bought with his money. They were all alike circumcised in token of their common interest in that covenant, of which circumcision v/as the appointed symbol. That covenant is still in force. “Know ye therefore,” says the apostle, “that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham. And the Scripture, foreseeing that God

would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying. In thee shall all nations be blessed. So then they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham." (Gal. iii.) To say, therefore, that the Abrahamic covenant was confined exclusively to

national and temporal privileges and obligations has the singular infelicity of contradicting the apostle.

Besides, what national and temporal privileges and obligations were confirmed to Ishmael and his posterity by the Abrahamic covenant, of which they received the sign and seal? Did they, or was it intended that they should, receive any inheritance in the promised land? Were they brought thereby under the bond of the Mosaic covenant? The Israelites were; but it must be remembered that "circumcision is not of Moses, but of the fathers." It signed and sealed a covenant which was made hundreds of years before the Jewish ceremonial law was given. "And this I say," observes the apostle, "that the covenant that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law which was four hundred and thirty years after cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect. For if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise; but God gave it to Abraham by promise." Can language be more explicit, more determinate, than this? Does not St. Paul tell us plainly that the Abrahamic covenant is substantially and essentially identical with the Christian covenant? And if children were embraced in the provisions of the former, what but a divine interdict can exclude them from the provisions of the latter? And no such interdict has ever been given. If, therefore, the children of the covenant were admitted to its symbolical rite under the old dispensation, why may they not be admitted under the new? Are the provisions of the latter less liberal, less extensive than those of the former?

§ 8. Unity of the Church Under all Dispensations.

We do not know how any unprejudiced person can read the Scriptures without seeing that the Church of God is essentially one and the same under every dispensation.

The term *church*, ἐκκλησία in the New Testament, corresponds with *congregation*, *kahal*, in the Old; and the latter is frequently so

rendered in the Septuagint, which sometimes interchanges it with *synagogue*, a word of the same import. St. Stephen, accordingly, speaking of Moses, says: "This is he that was in the Church in the wilderness" (Acts vii. 45), not in a promiscuous assembly, as the word ἐκκλησία sometimes denotes, but a regular ecclesiastical organization, called by St. Paul "a house," in which Moses acted as a servant, and afterward Christ as "a

Son," "whose house," says the apostle, "are we." (Heb. iii.; *cf.* Ps. xxii. 12; lxx. and Heb. ii. 12.)

This Church is often spoken of under the notion of a kingdom —"the kingdom of God," or, as Matthew frequently has it, "the kingdom of heaven." (Matt. xx. 1–16; xxii. 1–14.) This Church, or kingdom, our Lord told the Jews should be taken from them, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof. (Matt. xxi. 43.) *Cf.*, Matt. viii. 11, 12, where the Jews are styled "the children of the kingdom," and, because of their disobedience, threatened with a fearful expulsion. They were in possession of the privileges of the kingdom of God, as it existed in its introductory state, and they had a pre-emption right to the privileges of that kingdom in its perfected state; in which sense it was said by John the Baptist and by Christ to be nigh at hand. It was therefore offered first to them by our Lord himself and by his apostles, as Paul and Barnabas said to the Jews: "It was necessary that the word of God should first have been spoken to you; but seeing ye put it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles." (Acts xiii. 46.) Thus was the prediction of Christ verified.

The Church is compared by St. Paul to an olive-tree, which, planted by God in patriarchal times, continued to grow throughout the period of the Jewish dispensation; but some of the natural branches, being unfruitful, were broken off, and the branches of a wild olive-tree were, "contrary to nature," grafted in their place, and were thus made to "partake of the root and fatness of the olive-tree." Provision is, however, made on a prescribed contingency for the "natural branches" to "be grafted into their own olive-tree," "for God is able to graft them in again." (Rom. xi.; *cf.* Jer. xi. 16.) If this does not establish the essential identity of the Church under the different dispensations—no matter to what circumstantial changes it may have been subjected—it is not possible to establish any point, by any reasoning, illustration, or authority. Indeed, it does it

so fully, so forcibly, so obviously, as to forestall all objections, and to preclude all argument.

This great truth pervades the New Testament, particularly the Pauline Epistles, being frequently brought to view in an incidental, matter-of-course manner, and not as a point concerning which there might be any controversy. Accordingly, we know

395

of no controversy on this subject until it was superinduced by the emergencies of the Antipedobaptist divines.

§ 9. Baptism Substituted for Circumcision as Rite of Initiation.

That baptism is the ordinance of initiation into the Church, and the sign and seal of the covenant now, as circumcision was formerly, is evident. Thus St. Paul, in connection with the passages we have cited from his Epistle to the Galatians, uses this language: "As many of you as have been *baptized into Christ* have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female; but ye are all one in Christ Jesus. And if ye be Christ's, then are ye *Abraham's seed*, and heirs according to the promise." And so also in another place: "And in whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh, by the circumcision of Christ: buried with him in baptism." (Col. ii. 11, 12.)

Alluding to this text, Justin Martyr says: "We have not received that circumcision according to the flesh, but that circumcision which is spiritual; and, moreover, for indeed we were sinners, we have received this circumcision in baptism, for the purpose of God's mercy; and it is enjoined on all to receive it in like manner."

Fidus hesitated to baptize children before the eighth day after their birth, the period at which circumcision was administered. He wrote to Cyprian for his opinion, and that Father gave the judgment of sixty-six bishops in council, that infants might be baptized before the eighth day. This question never could have been raised had they not understood that baptism has taken the place of circumcision.

Chrysostom says emphatically, "There was pain and trouble in the practice of Jewish circumcision; but our circumcision—I mean the grace of baptism—gives cure without pain; and this for infants

as well as men."

Basil, in allusion to St. Paul's language, says: "Dost thou put off the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the flesh, which is done in baptism, when thou hearest our Lord say, 'Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God?'"

396

As external circumcision symbolizes the "circumcision of the heart in the spirit," so baptism symbolizes the same great act, the moral purification of the soul. Baptism, being a less rigorous rite than circumcision, is more congenial to the Christian economy than the latter, which was not inappropriate to the earlier and less benign dispensations. Nevertheless, as it is of the same mystical import, it signs and seals the same promise of mercy and pledge of obedience. And as that promise extends to our children as well as to us, it is our duty to do all in our power to make them parties to the covenant, as did also our father Abraham. "For the promise," says Peter, "is unto you and to your children." As God has not excluded them from the covenant, it seems a daring act of presumption in us to exclude them from the sign by which it is set forth, and the seal by which it is ratified.

§ 10. Infant Church-membership Recognized in the New Testament.

The membership of children in the Christian Church is formally recognized in the New Testament.

"They brought young children to Christ, that he should touch them; and his disciples rebuked those that brought them. And when Jesus saw it, he was much displeased, and said unto them, Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of God. Verily, I say unto you, whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein. And he took them up in his arms, put his hands upon them, and blessed them." (Mark x. 13–16.)

Let it be observed that the little children, τὰ παιδία, of Matthew and Mark, are styled τὰ βρέφη in Luke (xviii. 15), and the term βρέφος means *an infant, a babe*, or *suckling*. It is properly used of children not weaned. The Greek authorities say that the period of lactation extended to four years; among the Jews, it extended to

three years: during this time the child was called by this name, *brephos*.

The children that were brought to Christ must have been very young, as he took them up in his arms, put his hands upon them, and blessed them. It must be a pressing emergency that makes adults of these infants. But, apart from all hypercritical analysis or torturing of the text, can any unprejudiced man read this passage, and yet believe that Christ intended to exclude

children from membership in his Church? Those to whom he spoke knew that children were members of the Jewish Church, and that millions of infant souls have been admitted into the kingdom of God above; and could they imagine that the Saviour would ostracise these little ones from the Christian Church, the kingdom of God on earth? Even if he meant to say, "Let the children come, for persons like them are to be members of my Church," this does not exclude the little ones themselves: it rather includes them, especially as it is assigned as a reason why they should not be prevented from being brought to him to receive his blessing. But if this establishes their eligibility to membership in the Church, it confirms, by necessary sequence, their claim to baptism, through which alone they can be admitted to the visible kingdom of God.

To the same effect is the language of St. Paul: "For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by, or *to* the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by, or *to* the husband: else were your children unclean; but now are they *holy*." (1 Cor. vii. 14.)

This can not mean inherently righteous, for none are holy in this sense until they are born again.

Nor does it mean *legitimate*, as Dr. Gill and some others, including Albert Barnes, affirm; for this is no meaning of the word. It is used some five hundred times in the New Testament, and always in the sense of sanctification—reputed, relative, or real. Besides, the matter in question had nothing to do with legitimate and illegitimate unions; and of course the legitimacy or illegitimacy of their offspring has no place in the argument.

Furthermore, the word cannot mean persons with whom Christians may have familiar intercourse, according to the still more novel theory of Dr. Dagg, who, by the way, manifests no small ingenuity in its construction and learning in its defense. He supposes the children in question were the children of all the

Christians in the Corinthian Church—as if there was any parallel between the case of believing parents living with their children and that of a believing husband living with an unbelieving wife, or a believing wife with an unbelieving husband. Against the latter there had been a positive law of divine enactment; against the former there never had been any law, human or divine. No hypercritical analysis of the text, or correction

of the translation, can make it appear that because it is lawful for believing parents to live with their children, it is lawful for a believing husband or wife to live with an unbelieving consort. What curious logic! We venture to say, neither Jewish nor Gentile believers would be satisfied with the lawfulness of living with unbelieving husbands or wives, merely because Christian parents were not obliged to turn their children out-of-doors!

We do not think Dr. Dagg's philological criticisms give much support to his cause. As to the change of address from the third person to the second—"your children"—it is enough to say that transitions of this character are common in the Scriptures, and this chapter abounds with them. The same parties are spoken *of* and spoken *to*, interchangeably, a dozen times in a paragraph. In regard to the subjunctive rendering of the indicative, ἐστὶ "*were* unclean," grammarians tell us that the indicative frequently has a subjunctive force, particularly in Hellenistic Greek, in imitation of the Hebrew, which has no subjunctive form—and the sense requires it in the present case.[2] Our argument, however, has not much concern with these hairsplitting niceties.

With respect to the alleged identity of the holiness predicated of the unbelieving consort and that of the children, as being fatal to the common interpretation of this passage, it may suffice to say that there is an identity, but there is also a diversity. There are, in fact, three kinds of holiness involved in the premises, corresponding to the three parties involved: the first is a *real* holiness, appertaining to the believing husband or wife; the second is a *relative* holiness, appertaining to the children, in view of their baptism; and the third is a *reputed* holiness, appertaining to the unbelieving husband or wife, in view of the relation sustained to a believing consort. A family thus constituted would be considered a Christian family, whereas, in a parallel case among the Jews, the family would not be considered a Jewish family, but the children would remain

heathens like the heathen parent, not being admitted to circumcision until the latter became a proselyte, or until they became old enough to make a

399

formal renunciation of heathenism for themselves. Such mongrel matrimonial alliances were not tolerated by the Jewish law, and they were accordingly dissolved by Ezra and others. But Christianity is more liberal in its provisions. While, on the ground of expediency, it forbids believers to be "unequally yoked together with unbelievers," yet in cases where such unions subsist, in consequence of the conversion of one of the parties, it does not exclude their children from its pale. Instead of dealing with them and their Christian parent as heathens, because of the heathenism of the unbelieving parent, it embraces the former in its fold as cordially as if the latter were also a Christian.

The term *holy*, as used of such children, does not therefore imply that they were morally righteous, or lawfully begotten, or fit for parental fellowship; but that they were ceremonially clean or pure. The word is always used in the Septuagint in this sense, as the rendering of the Hebrew *kadosh*.

The argument is briefly this: If the children of a Christian parent, the husband or wife of a heathen, be permitted to take rank with the saints, ἅγια, that is. Christians, or members of the Church, as the word imports in the New Testament, the conjugal relation has been sanctified to a Christian husband or wife, so circumstanced, and must not be dissolved. This, as the context shows, was the point in dispute in the Corinthian Church; but it could not have been settled by such an argument as this, had not the Church-membership of children been an admitted fact.

We have not thought it necessary to cite authorities in support of this construction of the passage, as there is scarcely a critic—excepting, of course, the Antipedobaptists, who have reason enough to consider it, as they evidently do, a *crux criticorum*—who does not think that it refers to the baptismal consecration of children. So Tertullian, the oldest writer on the subject, believed; and how could he believe otherwise, when he knew that the term *holy* is never applied in the New Testament to any person not a member of the Church of Christ.[3]

400

The apostle evidently considers children members of the Church, and gives them instruction accordingly. “Children, obey your parents in the Lord; for this is right.” (Eph. vi. 1; Col. iii. 20.) Here the natural duty of filial obedience rises up into the importance of a Christian obligation; the phrase, *in the Lord*, implying a recognition of divine authority. This Epistle is directed to the Church at Ephesus, and in closing it, according to his manner, the apostle gives instructions of a practical character to the members of the Church. Among them were wives and husbands, children and parents, servants and masters; and the duties belonging to those several relations are specified and enforced upon a Christian basis. Accordingly, he says: “Children,”—τὰ τέκνα, those of you who are children—“obey your parents in the Lord.” And the fathers have a correspondent duty imposed upon them—to bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. Does not this clearly show that the children, as well as the parents, were members of the household of faith, and, as such, must have been introduced to the fellowship of the Church by baptism, as the Heaven-appointed ordinance of initiation?

§ 11. Errors To Be Avoided.

No one therefore need wonder that the Apostles, Fathers, Schoolmen, Reformers, “the holy Church throughout all the world,” in all its branches, except a small fragment, should baptize young children as well as adults. Indeed, it seems as though the baptism of the former should be looked after, if any difference can be imagined, with greater interest than that of the latter. It is of immense importance that children should be

matriculated as soon as possible in the school of Christ, and baptism is their matriculation.

Two errors are to be avoided: First, to attempt the training of children out of the school. They ought to be duly entered upon its register, personally recognized by pastors and teachers, who ought to assist parents in bringing them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, from their very birth; for then their education begins. It should be regular, authoritative, complete. The pupils should know their teachers, and the teachers their pupils. Parents should be

instructed that they are catechists of the Church, and their children catechumens of the Church, and their instruction should proceed on this basis. When old enough the young disciples should be brought more directly under the personal oversight and tuition of pastors and teachers, whose instruction and discipline should proceed on the basis of the baptismal vow.

The other error to be avoided is a very popular and a very pernicious one—viz., the baptizing of young children, and then suffering them to grow up in ignorance and sin, and to stray from the fold, just as if the mark of the Good Shepherd had not been placed upon them. This makes baptism, as Isaac Taylor sarcastically says, "a five-minutes' ceremony." It is a profanation of the holy ordinance. It is a palpable absurdity. Matriculate children as scholars, and then assign them no teachers, give them no instruction! Put the shepherd's mark upon the lambs, and open the door of the fold, and send them forth into the mountains to be devoured by beasts of prey! Take care of the sheep, by all means, but never mind the lambs; let them take care of themselves! What a cruel farce is this! If the Papists, with their *opus operatum*, should act thus, it would be strange enough; but for Protestants, who believe that the sacraments inure to our salvation just as their design is diligently and constantly carried out in our practice, it is passing strange that they should be so derelict, and it would be incredible if it were not every day before our eyes. The best defense of the baptism of young children is their careful training on the basis of their baptism, and the faithful assumption and discharge of their baptismal obligations "when they come to age."

I have not thought it necessary to note an objection to the baptism of young children sometimes urged—viz., that when

they come to age they may wish to receive adult baptism, and the Church does not favor the repetition of this sacrament. As there is no good reason for their repudiation of their baptism in infancy, we are not to neglect our duty to them because, forsooth, they may embrace erroneous views as to the mode and subjects of baptism. They may turn Quakers, and repudiate baptism altogether; or infidels, and renounce the creed of their baptism. We are not to make provision for error, but rather to do all in our power to preclude their embracing of it. Believers under the former dispensations circumcised their children, and pledged them to

observe all God's commandments, which are binding upon all, the sacrament being the solemn recognition of the obligation. No Jew ever declined to circumcise his child because he might wish adult circumcision in mature life. He was deemed "a son of the law," as Jews expressed it, when he was old enough to ratify in his own person the sacramental contract.

In the Discipline adopted at the organization of the Methethodist Episcopal Church in America, in 1784, there was this provision:

Q. 46. What shall be done with those who were baptized in their infancy, but have now scruples concerning the validity of infant baptism? *A.* Remove their scruples by argument, if you can; if not, the office may be performed by immersion or sprinkling, as the person desires.

But after 1786 this clause was canceled on account of its incongruity and mischievous tendency. The way to foster error is to make concessions to it. Let parents be urged to perform their duty to their children, and to leave the result to them and to God.

§ 12. Bishop Marvin on Infant Baptism and Parental Responsibility.

[In 1872, Bishop Marvin prepared an Introduction for a popular work on Infant Baptism. The Bishop took occasion to give full expression to his mature views, which are here transcribed as a fitting conclusion to the foregoing exposition of the Methodist doctrine on Infant Baptism:

There are two extreme views with respect to the Church, each of which is false and mischievous. In one view, the Church has official custody of the grace of God, which it dispenses by authority, through sacramental channels of communication. In the other, the Church is made nothing of, or next to nothing. Connection with it is held to be of little or no value. Its ordinances and means of grace are slighted as nothing worth.

It is true, beyond all question, that a man's relations with his Maker are to be determined by himself. He can confer no "power of attorney" upon the Church to attend to the business of salvation for him. He must come to God in his own person. In the vital process of repentance and faith, and in the mystery of the new birth, no proxy can be employed. Yet it is also true that God has ordained in the Church many efficient aids, many means of grace, through which the earnest penitent and the more advanced believer are alike strengthened and helped forward in the Christian race. The fellowship

of saints and the ordinances of religion quicken the spiritual perception and sensibilities, and encourage and strengthen faith.

The mere fact of membership in the Church exerts a most wholesome effect on the mind and heart. Of course, like all other aids and means of grace, it loses its effect upon the conscious and deliberate hypocrite, for all the means are to us what we make them by our manner of using them. Perversely and hypocritically used, they harden. But when used in the candor and simplicity of a genuine faith they are an invaluable agency in the development of the Christian life. Not that the Church confers salvation officially through them; but their use, in keeping with the laws of our being, quickens faith and commits us openly and formally to a Christian course. God makes them a blessing through a process altogether rational. In the same way the very fact of membership in the Church gives strength to our purposes. It separates us openly and formally from the world. It classifies us with the people of God. It brings home to us our high privileges, and puts us into a category altogether favorable to the service of God. It enforces upon our attention all the motives of piety.

It is not a matter of small consequence what relation our children shall sustain to the Church: whether they shall come upon the arena of that contest in which eternal life is lost or won, in their place in the militant host, or enter it singlehanded and without support.

The whole question of the relation of children to the Church is involved in the doctrine of infant baptism. . . . Several large denominations of Christians in our country are strangely heretical upon this subject. The popular mind has, to a considerable extent, been infected by false ideas. What with the heresy of baptismal regeneration on one side, and that of antipedobaptism on the other, there is need for a wide-spread presentation of the "truth as it in Jesus." Controversy for its own sake is undesirable, but when the interests of truth demand it it is not to be shunned. The incidental ill-feeling that may arise is to be regretted, but we must "contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints."

There is much shameful neglect of children by the Church and by Christian parents. The best possible results of Christian training are rarely realized, for the reason that the training itself is imperfect. A thorough course of training, where there is a due blending of authority, affection, and Christian teaching on the part of parents, and the proper care and influence on the part of pastors, with prayer and faith, would breed up a style of Christian now rarely seen among us.

This training, to answer to the divine ideal, must be based on baptism and the covenant therein entered into by the parent for the child. On what a vantage-ground is that child placed who has been brought into covenant with God by its parents!

The parental relation is greatly disparaged and degraded, so far at least as religion is concerned, by those who oppose infant baptism. They deny

of the parent to make a covenant for his child. How totally they misconceive the nature of the parental relation! The fact is, that during infancy the parent *does every thing for the child*, and is obliged to this by the very facts in the case. He must believe for the child and act for him in every interest, even the most vital. The child is in his hands, incapable of acting for itself, and *he must act for it, or let it perish.* The responsibility is on him, and he cannot avoid it. What food it shall eat, what atmosphere it shall live in, what medicine it shall take, he must determine. Nor does he make a title-deed in which he does not *covenant for his child as well as for himself*. If you say a man cannot enter into covenant for his child, you contradict nature itself, and the customs of mankind from the earliest ages.

If a man may not bind his child by a covenant *in the matter of religion*, it is an exception to the authority he holds in all civil relations. If this be so, an advantage is lost to the child *in this highest of all interests*, that is secured to it in all other cases. The *mature business judgment* of the father may be made available in the temporal interests of the child, not in the way of advice merely, but of the actual covenant transactions which are to inure to his benefit. But as to his soul, he may be bound by no stipulations, so that the intelligent and *mature faith* of the father are not available in any such substantial way for his spiritual wealth and safety. The very instance in which we would expect a gracious God to secure to the child the highest advantages of this relation, according to this unnatural theory, is the instance in which he is to reap no benefit from it whatever.

Where the filial feeling is properly evolved there is the deepest sense of obligation and honor in respect to the fulfillment of any covenant made by the parent. Let this feeling be properly fostered in the child, and then let him be trained to understand the force of the obligations that rest upon him from the baptismal covenant entered into on his behalf by his parents, and you have a class of motives to a Christian life of the most commanding character. These motives are totally wanting in the case of children unbaptized.

My neighbor says: "I will not bind my child in the affairs of his soul. He shall be *free*. He shall *choose for himself*." This is quite taking to the popular ear.

But I say: "My child shall *not* be free to go wrong, either in religion or any thing else, if I can help it—and more emphatically in religion than in any thing else. I will bind him by commands, by covenants, and by all the most sacred obligations, to serve God. I will environ him with motives that he shall feel it to be unnatural and monstrous for him to disregard. I will make it in the highest degree difficult and painful for him to go to hell."

To this view of the case the Church must be brought. There is much need of light amongst us upon this subject. Our own Church needs toning

up greatly. Thousands in the Church use little or no authority to turn the young, unpracticed feet of their children from the way of death. Many Methodists are incurring heavy guilt in this very thing.

Let it be understood, moreover, that the duty of offering our children to God in baptism is not the *whole* truth. The value of baptism to a child is found in the fact that it is the starting-point in a course of Christian training. Its chief value is in its relation to the subsequent training. Its significance is in this relation. If a thorough Christian training does not follow, then the value and significance of the baptism are never realized. There is need of a great awakening of the parental conscience.]

---

1. One of those arguments is worthy of note, as it contains the earliest reference to sponsors in baptism: *"Quid enim necesse est sponsores etiam periculo ingeri? quia et ipsi per mortalitatem destituere promissiones suas possunt, et proventu malae indolis falli."* "Why bring the *sponsors* into danger? because they may fail of their promises by death, and they may be deceived by the child's proving wicked." On this passage the learned annotator on Tertullian, Prior Philip, says: *"Puerorum susceptores qui Grecis* ἀνάδοχοι, *quasi fidejussores sunt. Eorum officium est infantem instruere, et ad benè vivendum adhortari et hinc sensum auctoris ediscere potes." De Baptismo*: c. xviii. "The undertakers of children are a kind of sureties. Their office is to train the children and exhort them to live well, and from this you may learn Tertullian's meaning." For any thing that appears in Tertullian's reference to sponsors in baptism; they may have been the parents of the children, as they were in the times of the apostles, and as they always ought to he; no others should he allowed as substitutes of the parents, except when the latter are dead or otherwise unavailable.↩
2. Accordingly, the Vulgate reads, "*Alioquin filii vestri immundi essent*;" and Tertullian: "*Ceterum immundi nascerentur.*" *De Anima*, c. xxxix. Compare 1 Cor. iv. 6; xv. 12, 35, 50; Gal. iv. 17; and see MacKnight's "Essays," iv. 9.↩
3. After describing the idolatrous rites by which the Romans consecrated their children to their deities, Tertullian says, *"Hinc enim et apostolus ex sanctificato alterutro sexu sanctos procreari ait, tam ex seminis praerogativa, quam ex institutionis disciplina. Ceterum, inquit, immundi nascerentur, quasi designatos tamen sanctitati, ac per hoc etiam saluti, inteligi volens fidelium filios."* "Hence, the apostle says, either parent being sanctified, the offspring are holy, as well by the privilege of descent as by the discipline of education. Otherwise, he

says, they were born unclean, yet they are, so to speak, appointed to holiness, and by that also to be saved." This holiness is baptismal; hence he adds: "Unless any one be born of water and of the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God—*id est, non erit sanctus*, that is, he cannot be holy." On which words the learned Rigaltius remarks: *"Id est, Christianus. Etenim Christiani, fratres, fideles, sancti. Sanctos, apostolus vocat cos, qui non sunt foris, sive extra ecclesiam. Sanctos opponit gentibus, ethnicis"*— "that is, Christians. For saints are Christians, brothers, faithful persons. The apostle calls those saints who are not without, or out of, the Church. He contrasts saints with Gentiles or heathens." *Vide Tertulliani*, *De Anima*, c. xxxix., *Works*, page 294, Paris folio ed., 1675.↩

Part VI.

Article XVIII.
Of the Lord's-supper.

405

The Supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another, but rather is a sacrament of our redemption by Christ's death: insomuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith, receive the same, the bread which we break is a partaking of the body of Christ; and likewise the cup of blessing is a partaking of the blood of Christ.

Transubstantiation, or the change of the substance of bread and wine, in the Supper of the Lord, cannot be proved by Holy Writ, but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions.

The body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, in the Supper, only after a heavenly and spiritual manner. And the means whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten, in the Supper, is faith.

The sacrament of the Lord's-supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshiped.

Introduction.

This article is, word for word, the same as the Twenty-eighth Article of the Anglican Confession, [except that in the first paragraph the pronoun "it" is omitted after the word "rather."]

Chapter I.
The Lord's-Supper: Design, Subjects, Matter, Form, Efficacy.

406

The article consists of four paragraphs. The first asserts:

> The Supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another but rather is a sacrament of our redemption by Christ's death: insomuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith receive the same, the bread which we break is a partaking of the body of Christ; and likewise the cup of blessing is a partaking of the blood of Christ.

§ 1. A Sign of Christian Love.

It is here affirmed that the Lord's-supper is a sign of the love which Christians have among themselves one to another. However much different sects may disagree in regard to the nature and design of this ordinance, they all agree in this point. The Supper is a family feast, to which none but members of the family are admitted, and from which none of them are excluded. It is thus a sacrament of friendship, a token of Christian affection.

To realize the full force of this it must be borne in mind that among the Orientals eating and drinking together has always been considered an expression of kindly regard, a bond of fellowship. Covenants were ratified in this way. As salt is a necessary condiment, always taken with food, so to eat of a man's salt was to testify agreement with him. It had the sanctity of an oath. Especially was this the case when a sacrifice was offered and they feasted upon it.

William the Conqueror had this in view when he swore Harold to fealty over the relics of the saints, secreted in the altar on which he was sworn. An ordinary oath might be broken, but hardly one taken with such solemnity. So when Christians eat and drink together the sacred emblems which represent the body and blood of Christ, they may well consider it a token of friendship not likely to be disregarded. Accordingly, none are welcomed to the Lord's table

except such as “are in love and charity with their neighbors.”

It is an exhibition of catholic love. Here we merge all political

and social distinctions, and show that we are all one in Christ Jesus. The spirit of the Lord’s-supper is that breathed by the apostle, “Grace be with all them that love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity.” (Eph. vi. 24.) In no other act is there so obvious a realization of “the communion of saints” professed in the Creed as in this. All the thoughts and feelings of devout communicants center around the Saviour; thus “they toward each other move,” as they all mutually “move toward him.” As Whitby says, in his note on 1 Cor. x. 16, 17: “Because the bread or loaf is one, of which we all partake, we, being many, are one body, for we are all partakers of one loaf, according to the old proverbial expression, σύσσιτοι καὶ σύσσιτοι.”

In this feast all meet as catholic Christians, holding in abeyance all peculiar views, whether of doctrine or of polity, receiving none to doubtful disputations, but receiving one another as Christ also hath received us, to the glory of God. (Rom. xiv. 1; xv. 7.)

It seems so strange that an institution thus designed, and so well adapted to promote the fellowship of saints, should have been made, more than all others, the occasion of alienation, division, and strife.

§ 2. A Sacrament of our Redemption.

But the article proceeds to say that the Lord’s-supper is a sacrament of our redemption by Christ’s death.

If we bear in mind the definition of a sacrament, we shall see that all the points meet in this ordinance. Notice first its divine institution. It was “ordained by Christ himself.” The account of the institution of the Lord’s-supper is given by the three Synoptists and by Paul in 1 Cor. xi.

After giving an account of the celebration of the Passover by our Lord and the twelve apostles, on the night before his death, Matthew says: “And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins. But I say unto you,

I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom. And when they had sung a hymn, they went out into the Mount of Olives." (Matt. xxvi. 26–30.) There

is a slight verbal variation in Mark xiv. 22–26: "And as they did eat, Jesus took bread, and blessed, and brake it, and gave to them, and said, Take, eat; this is my body. And he took the cup, and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them: and they all drank of it. And he said unto them, This is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many. Verily I say unto you, I will drink no more of the fruit of the vine, until that day that I drink it new in the kingdom of God. And when they had sung a hymn, they went out into the Mount of Olives." Matthew reports Christ's saying, "Drink ye all of it," which Mark omits, but adds, "and they all drank of it." Matthew has "for the remission of sins," which Mark omits. Luke places the remark concerning the eating and drinking in the kingdom of God immediately before the institution of the eucharist, which he records very briefly: "And he took bread, and gave thanks, and brake it, and gave unto them saying, This is my body which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me. Likewise also the cup after supper, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you." (Luke xxii. 19, 20.) Paul is a little fuller, but more like Luke than the others: "For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you. That the Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread: and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat; this is my body, which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood, this do ye as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come." Luke has "given for you," Paul has "broken." Luke has "which is shed for you," which Paul omits, adding, "this do ye as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me." Paul makes an explanatory remark, showing that our Lord, from whom he received the account of the institution, intended it to be observed through all time, till his second coming.

It is remarkable that John, who lay in the Saviour's bosom at the Supper, does not record the institution. We see where he would have inserted it if he had seen proper to record it, to wit after Judas

retired (John xiii. 30), and just before Christ delivered the paschal discourses (John xiv.-xvii.). John wrote long after

the Synoptists and Paul, and did not consider it necessary to do in this case what all four of them had done.

There are but one or two references to the Lord's-supper in the Acts of the Apostles, and only one other in the Epistles (1 Cor. x. 3, 4.), while they abound with references to baptism and preaching. The references are sufficiently numerous and explicit to show that it is of divine institution, and intended for permanent observance, but not so numerous and pronounced as to make the impression that this sacrament casts every thing else into the shade, as some of the Fathers, Schoolmen, Romanists, and Anglican divines would have us believe.

§ 3. The Subjects of This Ordinance.

The subjects of this ordinance are important to be noted, as the sacrament cannot be celebrated unless there are some to celebrate it. At its institution there were but eleven who partook of it, Judas having gone out on his traitorous errand. Jesus, of course, did not partake of the eucharist, as he had partaken of the passover. All the first communicants were apostles. It was not convenient to gather together all the disciples then in Jerusalem; so none but the apostles were invited, not even the mother of our Lord, or the other Marys, who were so beloved by the Saviour, and who loved him so much. It was not necessary that they should be at this commemorative service, as the Lord was still in person upon the earth. It was necessary that the apostles should be present, not only that they might be communicants, but that they might understand their Lord's design, and make it known to the world.

So far as appears from the Acts and 1 Corinthians, all the disciples of Christ, after the pentecostal affusion of the Spirit and the formal organization of the Church, partook of this ordinance; and ever since it has been considered the duty and privilege of all Christians to do this in remembrance of their dying Lord.

The question is sometimes raised whether any who are unbaptized should be allowed to come to the table, as none who were uncircumcised were allowed to eat the Passover, the

correspondent sacrament of the Jewish Church. Most certainly baptism is a prerequisite for communion, as the Lord's-supper is a Church ordinance designed for members of the Church, and none are members who are not baptized. But there may be exceptions

to this rule, as in cases where one who loves the Saviour, but has not had the opportunity to be baptized, is present at the administration of the Lord's-supper, and wishes thus to testify his attachment to his Lord. The will in such a case may be taken for the deed. He does not refuse baptism; is not ashamed of Jesus—rather the contrary—and no harm can result from his participating in this solemnity.

It is also sometimes asked whether any should commune who have not the witness of their acceptance with the Beloved, but are seeking it. Most assuredly they should. Of all men upon the earth, they need it most. The very act of communion, while they are laying hold of the outward thing, may enable them to lay hold of the thing signified. A poor penitent sinner, seeking pardon, receives the sacred symbols "rightly, worthily, and with faith," and thus has communion with Christ, and goes on his way rejoicing.

When superstitious notions of the sacrament began to take root in the Church, the eucharist was given to infants, and the absurd custom still obtains in the Greek Church. The case is altogether different from baptism, which is administered to infants as their matriculation in the school of Christ, where they are to be brought up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord; the one act of baptism extending in its virtue all through life. But the Lord's-supper requires repentance, faith, obedience—a ratification of the threefold vow of baptism—and a discerning of the Lord's body and blood, of which infants are incapable; hence the folly, not to say profanity, of giving infants the sacred symbols.

As the administrator is not of the essence of the sacrament, not a word is said about him in the New Testament. The Supper is celebrated rather than administered. Christ, of course, first administered to his disciples, but he did not partake of it himself. The apostles partook of it, but it is nowhere said that they administered it. It appears from 1 Cor. xi. that the members of the Church met together—at a stated time, says Pliny to Trajan; on the first day of the week, says Luke (Acts xx. 7)—and partook of a meal in common: their ἀγάπη or love-feast, at the close of which some of

the bread and wine were set apart from a common to a sacred use, and eaten and drunk in commemoration of Christ. Nothing could be more simple, beautiful,

411

and edifying. With what ceremonies it was celebrated we are not informed, and who administered it is not stated. It is quite likely that the pastor presided, so that all things might be clone decently and in order; but this was not necessary to make it a sacrament. It is well to restrict the administration ordinarily to pastors and other Church officers, and any Church has the right to adopt rules in the premises, which ought to be observed to prevent confusion and to minister to edification. Otherwise we see not why any company of Christians might not reverently eat and drink in remembrance of Christ, and enjoy all the spiritual blessings of this sacrament. Those who think differently must bring forward better authority for their opinions than the superstitious deliverances of Ignatius, or the pseudo-Ignatius, and other Fathers, and the canons of the Council of Trent.

Alford well remarks on 1 Cor. x. 16: *the bread which we bless*:

> Observe, the first person plural is the same throughout: the blessing of the cup, and the breaking of the bread, the acts of consecration, were *not the acts of the minister, as by any authority peculiar to himself, but only as the representative of the* οἱ πάντες*, the whole Christian congregation* (and so even Estius, but evading the legitimate inference). The figment of sacerdotal consecration of the elements by transmitted power is as alien from the apostolic writings as it is from the spirit of the gospel.

Truly it is, and this is an important admission from an Anglican divine. Estius was an able Romish exegete. He knew well enough that Paul never dreamed of any sacerdotal consecration and administration of the Lord's-supper, whatever his Church might superstitiously and arrogantly hold in the premises.

§ 4. The Matter of This Sacrament.

As to the matter of this sacrament, it is clearly stated that it consisted of bread and wine, such as was commonly used for food. Of course the bread used by our Lord at the institution of the eucharist was unleavened bread, as none else was eaten at the time of the Passover.

The Roman Catechism says:

As, however, there are different sorts of bread, composed of different materials, such as wheat, barley, pease, or made in different manners, such as leavened and unleavened; it is to be observed that, with regard to the former, the sacramental matter, according to the words of our Lord, should consist of wheaten bread; for when we simply say bread we mean, according to common usage, "wheaten bread." This is also distinctly declared by a figure of the holy eucharist in the

Old Testament: the Lord commanded that the loaves of proposition, which prefigured the sacrament, should be made of fine flour.

We might remark that this is not a very distinct declaration, as there is no proof that the shew-bread was a type of this sacrament. The Catechism proceeds:

As, therefore, wheaten bread alone is the proper matter of this sacrament, a doctrine handed down by apostolic tradition, and confirmed by the authority of the Catholic Church, it may also be inferred from the circumstances in which the eucharist was instituted, that this wheaten bread should be unleavened. It was consecrated and instituted by our Lord, on the first day of unleavened bread, a time when the Jews were prohibited by the law to have leavened bread in their houses. . . . The peculiar propriety of the consecration of unleavened bread, to express the integrity and purity of heart with which the faithful should approach this sacrament, we learn from these words of the apostle: "Purge out the old leaven, that ye may be a new paste, as you are unleavened; for Christ, our Pasch, is sacrificed. Therefore let us feast not with the old leaven, not with the leaven of malice and wickedness, but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth." This property of the bread, however, is not to be considered so essential as that its absence must render the sacrament null: both sorts, leavened and unleavened, are called by the common name, and have each the nature and properties of bread. No one, however, should on his own individual authority have the temerity to depart from the laudable rite observed in the Church to which he belongs; and such departure is the less warrantable in priests of the Latin Church, commanded, as they are, by authority of the Supreme Pontiff, to celebrate the sacred mysteries with unleavened bread only.

As the Romanists lay so much stress upon the argument for the use of unleavened bread, that such was used at the institution of the eucharist, how comes it that they administer in the form of a wafer, with the representation of a crucified Christ on it? Did not our Lord break the bread when he gave it to his disciples? and did he not tell them, "Do this in remembrance of me?"

The Greeks utterly repudiate the Romish eucharist administered with unleavened bread. They stigmatize the Romanists as “Azymites,” a term implying “ without leaven.” It was natural for the Greeks to use leavened bread, as from the time of the apostles that was used in the Lord’s-supper. The primitive Christians held their love-feast on Sunday, in which they ate and drank together in a social way. At the conclusion of the repast they took some of the bread and wine thus provided, and set it apart for the eucharist, which immediately followed. (1 Cor. xi.) When this custom ceased, and the *agapae* were abolished, the Greeks retained the common, or leavened, bread.

413

So in the eighth century unleavened bread came into use in the Latin Church. In the eleventh century the Greeks declared this a heresy. At the Council of Florence, in 1439, it was agreed, in order to promote the union of the Churches, that either kind might be used, but the Greeks soon rejected the Council and its decrees, and they will not tolerate the Azymites.

In the Church of England unleavened bread was prescribed by Queen Elizabeth, and was generally used during her reign. It was retained at Westminster till 1642, and its use has never been forbidden, but the use of leavened bread is now general in the Anglican Church and its offshoots. A rubric says:

> To take away all occasion of dissension and superstition, which any person hath, or might have, concerning the bread and wine, it shall suffice that the bread be such as is usual to be eaten; but the best and purest wheat bread that conveniently may be gotten.

But the bread usually eaten is leavened. Why they *cut* the bread, when our Lord *broke* it and intimated that we should do the same, does not appear.

Upon the whole we prefer unleavened bread made of wheaten flour, not cut, but prepared in cakes convenient to be broken and distributed to the communicants, putting it into their hands and not into their mouths, like the Lutherans. But we do not lay much stress upon these points. The element in this case is not so clearly defined as to restrict it absolutely to wheaten bread, leavened or unleavened, as is the case with regard to the other element.

“The fruit of the vine” is a Hebraism for wine, which is the fermented juice of the grape. Indeed the Greeks used similar figures; Anacreon calls wine γόνον ἀμπέλου, “the offspring of the vine.”

(Ode i., line 7.) So frequently in Greek literature: *αἷμα βοτρύων*, "the blood of grapes." *Cf.* Deut. xxxii. 14: "The blood of the grape."

The Roman Catechism says:

The sacred element of this sacrament, which forms part of its matter, consists of wine pressed from the grape, mingled with a little water. That our Lord made use of wine in the institution of this sacrament, has been at all times the doctrine of the Catholic Church. He himself said, "I will not drink, henceforth, of this fruit of the vine until that day." On these words of our Lord St. Chrysostom observes: "Of the fruit of the vine, which certainly produces wine, not water, as if he had it in view, even at so early a period, to crush by the evidence of these words the heresy which asserted that water alone is to be used in these

mysteries." With the wine used in the sacred mysteries the Church of God, however, has always mingled water, because this admixture renews the recollection of the blood and water which issued from his sacred side. The word water we also find used in the Apocalypse, to signify the people, and therefore water mixed with wine signifies the union of the faithful with Christ their Head. This rite, derived from apostolic tradition, the Catholic Church has at all times observed. The propriety of mingling water with the wine rests, it is true, on authority so grave that to omit the practice would be to incur the guilt of mortal sin; however, its sole omission would be insufficient to render the sacrament null. But care must be taken not only to mingle water with the wine, but also to mingle it in small quantities, for in the opinion of ecclesiastical writers the water is changed into wine. Hence these words of Pope Honorius: "A pernicious abuse has prevailed for a long time amongst you of using in the holy sacrifice a greater quantity of water than of wine; whereas, in accordance with the rational practice of the universal Church, the wine should be used in much greater quantity than the water." We have now treated of the only two elements of this sacrament, and although some dared to do otherwise, many decrees of the Church justly enact that no celebrant offer any thing but bread and wine.

One cannot help smiling at the childish reasons for the mingling of water with the wine; and the assertion that to omit it is a mortal sin, though it would not nullify the sacrament.

The heretics alluded to by Chrysostom were a set of ascetics, called Aquarians, because, as they considered the use of wine, animal food, and marriage unlawful, they used water instead of wine in their pretended eucharist, hence their name "Aquarians." Hook says:

It is lamentable to see so bold an impiety revived in the present day, when certain men, under the cloak of temperance, pretend a eucharist

without wine or any fermented liquor. These heretics are not to be confounded with those against whom St. Cyprian discourses at large in his "Letter to Cicilian," who, from fear of being discerned from the smell of wine, by the heathen, in times of persecution, omitted the wine in the eucharist cup. It was indeed very wrong, and unworthy of the Christian name, but far less culpable than the pretense of a temperance above that of Christ and the Church, in the *Aquarii*. Origen engaged in a disputation with them.

The Christians of St. Thomas, an ignorant, superstitious sect in a peninsula of India, use in the Lord's-supper little cakes made with oil and salt, and instead of wine, water in which raisins have been steeped.

It is said that Oberlin, in the mountains of Switzerland, used instead of wine melted snow, served up in wooden bowls.

The Hebrews, Greeks, and Romans usually mixed water with their wine in their symposia; the symposiarch, or master of the feast, determined the proportions. They did this partly because

they considered it more salutary than either wine or water by itself. Thus the author of 2 Maccabees xv. 39 says: "It is hurtful to drink wine or water alone, and wine mingled with water is pleasant and delighteth the taste." But at their banquets, which lasted for hours, they drank a great deal; hence they diluted the wine to prevent inebriation. This was done by the Jews at their Passover. Our Lord and his disciples very probably complied with the common usage, and the rather as the use of wine was not prescribed in the institution of the Passover.

The early Christians mixed water with the wine in the Lord's-supper. Sometimes the proportion of water was one-fourth; sometimes one-third. The Romish Church uses cold water; the Greeks first put in cold and, after the consecration, add warm: thus designing to symbolize the water which flowed from the side of Christ, and the fire of the Holy Ghost.

Theophylact and Nicephorus condemn the Armenians for not mixing water with the wine.

McClintock and Strong, in their Cyclopedia (Art. "Lord's-supper") say:

> The sacred element used by Christ was wine. It is not certain of what color the wine was, nor whether it was pure or mixed with water, and both points were always regarded as indifferent by the Christian Church. The use

of mixed wine is said to have been introduced by Pope Alexander I.; it was expressly enacted in the twelfth century by Clement III., and divers allegorical significations were given to the mingling of these two elements. Also the Greek Church mingles the wine with water, while the Armenian and the Protestant Churches use pure wine. The question as to whether the wine originally used in the Lord's-supper was *fermented* or not would seem to be a futile one in view of the facts: (1) that the unfermented juice of the grape can hardly with propriety be called *wine* at all; (2) that fermented wine is of almost universal use in the East; and (3) that it has universally been employed for this purpose in the Church of all ages and countries. But for the excessive zeal of certain modern well-meaning reformers, the idea that our Lord used any other would hardly have gained the least currency.

Upon the whole we conclude that it would be better not to pretend to celebrate the Lord's-supper than to do it with water, unfermented grape or raisin juice, or any other slop. Get the pure, fermented, generous juice, "the blood of the grape," and if possible let it be red, as best setting forth the thing signified.

§ 5. The Form of This Sacrament.

The *form* of this sacrament is not prescribed like the *matter*, yet it is essential to its due celebration. We could hardly consider

it a sacramental act to put bread and wine on the table, and eat and drink it in remembrance of Christ, without uttering a sentence. Some form of speech seems necessary to set forth the nature and design of the action.

This is what is commonly called "consecration of the elements." Romanists say this is done by the priest's pronouncing the words *hoc est enim corpus meum*—"for this is my body"—at the consecration of the bread, when they allege it is changed into the body, blood, soul, and divinity of Christ; and at the consecration of the wine, "This is the chalice of my blood of the new and eternal testament: the mystery of faith, which shall be shed for you and for many, to the remission of sins," when the wine undergoes a similar change. They sustain this view, as usual, by references to Fathers and Councils; and the Catechism adds:

> The necessity of every other proof is superseded by these words of the Saviour, "This do for a commemoration of me." This command of our Lord embraces not only what he did, but also what he said, and has more

immediate reference to his own words, uttered not less for the purpose of effecting than of signifying what they effect.

The Catechism is a poor commentary; hence it would not be necessary to repudiate so absurd an exposition, if it had not found favor with Hooker and some other Protestant divines. Now, it is obviously not the case that our Lord, when he spoke those words, made his apostles priests, and told them to say and do what he was doing in consecrating the elements. He did not mean that they were to celebrate as priests, but to take, eat, and drink, as his disciples; they were to do this in remembrance of him, as Paul says, "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death until he come."

The Roman Catechism continues:

That these words constitute the form is easily proved from reason alone. The form of a sacrament is that which signifies what is accomplished in the sacrament; what is accomplished in the eucharist, that is, the conversion of the bread into the true body of our Lord, the words, this is my body, signify and declare; they therefore constitute the form. The words of the Evangelist, "he blessed," go to support this reasoning. They are equivalent to saying: "Taking bread, he blessed it, saying, This is my body." The words "Take and eat," it is true, precede the words "This is my body," but they evidently express the use, not the consecration, of the matter, and cannot therefore constitute the form. But though not necessary to the consecration of the sacrament, they are not, however, on any account, to be omitted. The conjunction "for" has also a place amongst the words of consecration;

417

otherwise it would follow that if the sacrament were not to be administered to any one, it should not, or even could not, be consecrated; whereas that the priest, by pronouncing the words of our Lord, according to the institution and practice of the Church, truly consecrates the proper matter of the sacrament, although it should afterward happen never to be administered, admits not the least shadow of doubt.

One may afford to smile when the Catechism calls that *reasoning*. The form of the sacrament signifies no such transmutation of the matter; it simply denotes its design and use. A singular sacrament that must be which is never administered. How would it be in the case of the other sacrament? Would that be baptism in which water is blessed, but never applied to the subject?

It may be the case that it would be a valid sacrament if the proper matter (bread and wine) were set forth, and the words of

Christ recited, "This is my body; this is my blood," as a form indicating the design, to wit, to represent the body and blood of Christ, and then the elements were reverently eaten and drunk. But unless there was a charm in the words *Hoc est corpus meum, Hic est sanguis*, etc. (as the Romanists maintain), we see no reason for confining the form to these words.

Dr. Knapp says, judiciously ("Christian Theology," p. 504.):

Christ distinguished this ordinance from the Passover, which immediately preceded, by offering up a prayer of thanks (εὐχαριστήσας or εὐλογήσας), which was probably one of the brief thanksgivings common among the Jews, as neither of the evangelists has thought necessary to record the words. He then stated briefly the object of this ordinance. In both of these particulars the example of Christ is properly followed in the administration of the Supper. It is customary to offer thanks to God, briefly to state the object of this ordinance, and thus solemnly set apart the bread and wine to this sacred use. *Vide* 1 Cor. x. 16, ποτήριον εὐλογίας, ὃ εὐλογοῦμεν—*i. e.*, the wine in the cup, which we consecrate to this use by the prayer of thanks. It is also said elsewhere respecting those who thank God for the enjoyment of other food, that they partake of μετ' εὐλογίας, 1 Tim. iv. 5; Luke ix. 16.

This solemn opening of the Supper with prayer and reference to the command of Jesus is called *consecration*, and is proper and according to the will of Christ. *Consecration*, therefore, in the Lord's-supper, consists properly in a solemn reference to the object of the Supper, and in the devout prayer accompanying this, and not in the repetition of the words, *this is my body* and *this is my blood.* These words are uttered merely in order to make the nature and object of the ordinance then to be celebrated properly understood; so our symbolical books uniformly teach. Hence these words were frequently repeated by Christ during the celebration of the ordinance, and were used alternatively with other expressions. This consecration is not to be supposed to possess any magical or miraculous power. Nothing

like this was attributed to this rite by the older Church Fathers, who used *consecrare* as synonymous with ἁγιάζειν and *sanctificare*, *to set apart from a common, and consecrate to a sacred use.* By degrees, however, a magical effect was attributed to consecration, and it was supposed to possess a peculiar power. This was the case even with Augustin. And when afterward the doctrine of transubstantiation prevailed in the Romish Church, it was supposed that the change in the elements was effected by pronouncing over them the blessing, and especially the words of Christ, *this is my body*, etc.

Bingham says (Antiq. xv., iii., 11):

The form of consecration anciently was not a bare repetition of these words, *Hoc est corpus meum*, "This is my body," which for many ages has been the current doctrine of the Romish schools; but a repetition of the history of the institution, together with prayers to God that he would send his Holy Spirit upon the gifts, and make them become the body and blood of Christ; not by altering their nature and substance, but their qualities and powers, and exalting them from simple elements of bread and wine to become types and symbols of Christ's flesh and blood, and efficacious instruments of conveying to worthy receivers all the benefits of his death and passion.

The learned antiquary gives in detail an abundance of patristic testimonies to this effect.

Wheatly (on the Book of Common Prayer, vi., xxii.) says:

The Prayer of Consecration is the most ancient and essential part of the whole Communion Office; and there are some who believe that the apostles themselves, after a suitable introduction, used the latter part of it, from those words, *who in the same night, etc.*, and it is certain that no liturgy in the world hath altered that particular. But besides this, there was always inserted in the primitive forms a particular petition for the descent of the Holy Ghost upon the sacramental elements, which was also continued in the first liturgy.

Wheatly in his subsequent discussion does not call it transubstantiation, but his description applies to something very near akin to it. "The priest performs to God," forsooth, "the representative sacrifice of the death and passion of his Son," whereas there is no priest to do any such thing, and there is no such thing to be done.

It is true that in the Reformed Churches there is always a recital of the words of institution, but it is always preceded and followed by prayer and thanksgiving; and their divines draw no distinction between the parts of the service as to what is the essential form and what are the circumstantial accompaniments. They do not commonly make any special address to the communicants when distributing the elements. The Romish priests deny the cup to the laity; they step around to the communicants who are kneeling near the altar, take a "host" out of a chalice,

and give one to each saying: *Corpus Domini nostri Jesu Christi custodiat aninam tuam in vitam eternam.*

In the Lutheran Church, after the consecration of the bread and wine, the minister puts a "host" into the communicant's mouth,

saying: “Take, eat: this is the body of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; may it strengthen and preserve you in the true faith unto life everlasting. Amen.” And so in giving the cup: “Take, drink: this is the blood,” etc.

The Church of England has a complicated service, but it is not superstitious. The prayer of consecration embodies the words of institution, and in giving the bread and wine to the communicants the minister says:

> The body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life. Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on him in thy heart by faith, with thanksgiving.
>
> The blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was shed for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life. Drink this in remembrance that Christ’s blood was shed for thee, and be thankful.

The Methodist Churches have an abridgment of the English office, with a few verbal changes, retaining the Prayer of Consecration, and the address to the communicants in giving the elements.

The mode of celebrating the eucharist is not essential to the sacrament; it is not to be confounded with the form. It must be done in some way, but that is left to the discretion of the Church.

The apostles most likely communed, at the institution of the ordinance, in a recumbent posture, that being common at that time in eating the passover, though when that feast was instituted it was eaten standing. This shows that our Lord and his disciples laid but little stress on postures and gestures.

The Lutherans and some others stand in communing. The Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Baptists, and some others sit during the entire service, except that they sometimes stand during the prayers and concluding doxology and benediction. The Puritans were violently opposed to kneeling, as they thought it looked like the adoration of the elements.

The Anglican Church and its offshoots, and the Methodist Churches, vary their posture during the celebration: standing when the Creed is rehearsed and hymns are sung; kneeling when

the elements are received to evince humility, and to show that the Lord’s-supper is not like an ordinary feast; and sitting during the remainder of the service. This mode seems best adapted to

edification. But any of the modes mentioned may be edifying to those who prefer them.

Upon the whole it may be concluded that the *form* of the Lord's-supper may consist of the recital of any words which set forth the nature and design of the ordinance; but it is most expedient to use the words of institution in connection with a prayer of thanksgiving—εὐχαριστία—which was so prominent in the celebration of this ordinance in the Primitive Church that from it it has received the name of "The Eucharist." Though the address to the communicants in the distribution of the elements is not essential to the ordinance, and so is no part of the *form*, yet it is solemn and edifying, and as such is prescribed by our Church.

§ 6. Efficacy of This Sacrament.

The *efficacy* of this sacrament is so set forth in this article as to utterly repudiate the *opus operatum* superstition of Rome: "It is a sacrament of our redemption by Christ's death, insomuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith receive the same, the bread which we break is a partaking of the body of Christ, and likewise the cup of blessing is a partaking of the blood of Christ." But lest any should have any doubt in regard to the meaning of this clause, the English Reformers framed another article (xxix.) in title and words as follows:

Of the Wicked, which eat not the Body of Christ in the use of the Lord's-supper.

The wicked and such as be void of a lively faith, although they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth (as St. Augustin saith) the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, yet in nowise are they partakers of Christ; but rather, to their condemnation, do eat and drink the sign or sacrament of so great a thing.

Other passages of a similar import are found in Augustin's writings, and in those of Origen, Zeno, Jerome, and others; and as Burnet says:

To all this a great deal may be added to show that this was the doctrine of the Greek Church, even after Damascene's opinion concerning the assumption of the elements into a union with the body of Christ was received among them. But more need not be said concerning this, since it will be readily granted that, if we are in the right in the main point of

denying the corporeal presence, this will fall with it.

Of course; and hence Burnet devotes less than two pages to

the discussion of this Twenty-ninth Article, and Wesley eliminated the article from our Confession.

The efficacy of this sacrament is wholly of a spiritual character. Objectively, all may be right in the sacrament; subjectively, all may be wrong. The efficacy depends upon God's blessing accompanying the reception of the elements, "rightly, worthily, and with faith," and, as is stated in the third paragraph of this article, "the means whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper, is faith."

This is eminently the sacrament of faith. We come to it with faith, and our faith is wonderfully increased in this ordinance. The least *modicum* of faith which warrants an approach to the Lord's table is a belief in the points concerning Christ contained in the Apostles' Creed, and such a "discerning of the Lord's body" in the ordinance as implies a recognition of the elements as "a sacrament of our redemption by Christ."

The Lord's-supper is thus a monumental service: a standing evidence of the great fact that Christ died for our sins. We have the strongest historical proofs—proofs which no one will challenge—that the Lord's-supper has been celebrated ever since the time of its institution.

For from that night, successive bands
Have kept this banquet of the cross,
Saint, pilgrim, martyr of all lands,
And counted earthly portions loss.

As the Passover was a monument of the redemption of Israel from Egypt, so the eucharist is a monument of our redemption by Christ, *monumentum aere perennius*. If Christ did not die for our sins, would this monument have been raised? Were the apostles devoid of reason? Have their successors for eighteen centuries been similarly bereft? Such must be the case if this ordinance has been celebrated in memory of Christ's death through all these centuries, and yet Christ did not die for our sins according to the Scriptures. But this ordinance is "a perpetual memory of that his precious death until his coming again."

Who thus our faith employ

His sufferings to record,
E'en now we mournfully enjoy
Communion with our Lord;
As though we every one
Beneath his cross had stood.

422

And seen him heave, and heard him groan,
And felt his gushing blood.

Our faith lifts the veil of time, and places us, with the three Marys and the beloved disciple, near the cross, and

By faith his head we see him bow
And hear him breathe his last.

Thus our faith, which makes this to us "a sacrament of our redemption by Christ's death," is wonderfully increased and strengthened in this symbolical service.

If we are duly exercised at the Lord's table, our faith will not only clearly apprehend the fact and design of the Saviour's death, but it will also appropriate the merits thereof to our own personal salvation. We not only see the elements broken and poured forth and distributed, but we put forth our hands, take of them, eat and drink and assimilate them, so that they enter into our living, personal organism. Thus every communicant is addressed at the distribution of the elements: "The body of our Lord Jesus Christ, . . . the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given, which was shed for thee, preserve thy soul and body unto everlasting life. Take and eat this; drink this, in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving."

This is a personal, experimental application of the merits of Christ's death: the only way in which we can eat his body and drink his blood, and have communion with him. The seal of the covenant of our redemption by Christ is applied in this ordinance, and by a worthy participation thereof we realize our interest in the same.

To this dear covenant of thy word
I set my worthless name;
I seal the engagement to my Lord,
And make my humble claim.

Thy light, and strength, and pardoning grace,
And glory, shall be mine;

My life and soul, my heart and flesh,
And all my powers are thine.

"It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing." (John vi. 63.) Though our Lord's discourse at Capernaum, in which these words occur, had no reference to the eucharist, which was not yet instituted, yet the eucharist has reference to that or is illustrated thereby. "I am the bread of life: he that

cometh to me shall never hunger, and he that believeth on me shall never thirst." That settles the question. We come to Christ by faith; we believe on him, and so obtain "eternal life." "He that eateth me, even he shall live by me."

This sacrament, as it vividly sets forth the object of faith, so it assists in its exercise, in laying hold on the thing signified, and is thus not only "an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace," but also "a means whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us thereof."

The sacred, true, effectual sign,
Thy body and thy blood it shows;
The glorious instrument divine
Thy mercy and thy strength bestows.

But "it is the Spirit that quickeneth." Hence the necessity of invoking his influence when entering upon this solemn service:

Come, Holy Ghost, set to thy seal.
Thine inward witness give,
To all our waiting souls reveal
The death by which we live.

Then our faith passes from a mere assent to an historical fact, which is attested in the Lord's-supper; to a realizing, appropriating factor, a vital and vitalizing element in our experience, according to the prayer of the poet:

O that our faith may never move,
But stand unshaken as thy love:
Some evidence of things unseen.
Now let it pass the years between,
And view thee bleeding on the tree.
My God, who dies for me, for me!

Whatever increases our faith confirms our hope. This sacrament has reference to the future as well as to the past. “For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord’s death till he come.” (1 Cor. xi. 26.) Thus it recognizes him as “delivered for our offenses, and raised again for our justification” (Rom. iv. 25); as “ever living to make intercession for us” (Heb. vii. 25); and as “coming again to receive us unto himself, that where he is we may be also,” as he assured his disciples, when he instituted this sacrament (John xiv. 1–6). “Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation.” (Heb. ix. 28.)

424

This ordinance would indeed deserve to be ranked with “beggarly elements” if it did not refer to Christ as dying for our sins according to the Scriptures; buried and raised again the third day, according to the Scriptures, and thus “become the first-fruits of them that slept,” the sure and certain guarantee of “the resurrection of the dead and the life of the world to come.” Thus at “giving the bread” we sing:

Who in these lower parts
Of thy great kingdom feast,
We feel the earnest in our hearts
Of our eternal rest.

Yet still a higher seat
We in thy kingdom claim,
Who here begin by faith to eat
The supper of the Lamb.

And at “giving the cup:”

The fruit of the vine—the joy it implies—
Again we shall join, to drink in the skies.
Exult in his favor, our triumph renew.
And I, saith the Saviour, will drink it with you!

The festal character of this ordinance is admirably adapted, and was divinely designed, to excite and confirm our hope. At such a banquet as this there is no room for doubt and fear and diffidence and despondency and gloom.

Let us indulge a cheerful frame.
For joy becomes a feast.

How pregnantly is this suggested by the very elements used in the Lord's-supper:

With living bread and generous wine,
He cheers this sinking heart of mine.

"Wine that maketh glad the heart of man, and bread which strengtheneth man's heart." (Ps. civ. 15.) How prominently is this feature of the sacrament brought out in our eucharistic service!

As this sacrament is designed and adapted to increase our faith, and confirm our hope, so also is it designed and adapted to perfect our love. It is in the highest sense a feast of love. The primitive Christians crowned and closed their *agapae*, or love-feasts, with the Lord's-supper. This was well and wisely done. Their love to the Saviour being thus inflamed and

strengthened, they could not fail to love one another with a pure heart fervently.

When we look upon the portrait of a friend and benefactor, our gratitude is excited, and we cannot refrain from expressions of warm affection. This sacrament is a memorial of Christ; a "picture of his passion." It reminds us of him; it brings him to our view in the most affecting passage of his history, in his death, his violent, shameful, agonizing death; his propitiatory, vicarious death; the death which he endured for us; the death by which we live, for he laid down his life for us. Nothing so vividly reminds us of the great love wherewith he loved us, and our obligation to love him in return, as this "sacrament of our redemption by his death." Hence the Church appropriately begins this service with confession of sins, and closes it with thanksgiving for the "remission of our sins, and all other benefits of his passion." And in view of his atoning sacrifice, thus symbolized in the sacrament, and realized by faith, we unite in the solemn dedication of ourselves to him in return for his amazing love. "And here we offer and present unto thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto thee." Like some of the Psalms, it is designed "to bring to remembrance."

While yet his anguished soul surveyed
Those pangs he would not flee,
"What love his latest words displayed—
"Meet and remember me!"

Where all the three theological virtues—faith, hope, and love—are thus developed and brought into harmonious exercise, nothing can be absent which is necessary to complete the Christian character. It is in this sense that

> This eucharistic feast
> Our every want supplies,
> And still we by his death are blest.
> And share his sacrifice;
> By faith his flesh we eat,
> Who here his passion show;
> And God, out of his holy seat.
> Shall all his gifts bestow.

Chapter II.
Transubstantiation.

426

The second paragraph in this article reads thus:

Transubstantiation, or the change of the substance of bread and wine in the Supper of the Lord, cannot be proved by Holy Writ, but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions.

§ 1. Addition in King Edward's Article.

In the article as set forth in the reign of Edward VI. there was this additional paragraph against transubstantiation:

Forasmuch as the truth of man's nature requireth that the body of one and the self-same man cannot be at one time in divers places, but must needs be in one certain place, therefore the body of Christ cannot be present at one time in many and divers places; and because, as Holy Scripture doth teach, Christ was taken up into heaven, and there shall continue unto the end of the world; a faithful man ought not either to believe or openly confess the real and bodily presence, as they term it, of Christ's flesh and blood in the sacrament of the Lord's-supper.

Burnet suggests that this was omitted when the articles were revised under Elizabeth, lest the rejection of the "real presence" might offend some "in whom the old leaven had gone deep;" and because it "went too much upon the principles of natural philosophy, which how true soever, they might not be the proper subject of an article of religion." But he says the original subscription by both Houses of Convocation shows that the revisers included this paragraph, though, for the reasons assigned, they thought it expedient to correct it and print the following paragraph in its stead: "The body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper, only after a heavenly and spiritual manner. And the means whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is faith."

The paragraph in question may have been omitted from undue regard to the Lutheran believers in Consubstantiation; but surely its

omission would not reconcile the Romish believers in transubstantiation to the article, seeing it is leveled directly and in so many words against that absurd dogma.

§ 2. The Tridentine Doctrine.

427

But let us see what is the dogma of transubstantiation, as held by the Church of Rome. The Council of Trent (Ses. xiii. ch. i.) says:

> In the first place the holy Synod teaches, and openly and simply professes, that, in the august sacrament of the holy eucharist, after the consecration of the bread and wine, our Lord Jesus Christ, true God and true man, is truly, really, and substantially contained under the species of those sensible things. For neither are these things mutually repugnant—that our Saviour himself always sitteth at the right hand of the Father in heaven, according to the natural mode of existing, and that nevertheless he be, in many other places, sacramentally present to us in his own substance by a manner of existing, which, though we can scarcely express it in words, yet can we, by the understanding illuminated by faith, conceive, and we ought most firmly to believe, to be possible unto God: for thus all our forefathers, as many as were in the true Church of Christ, who have treated of this most holy sacrament, have most openly professed that our Redeemer instituted this so admirable a sacrament at the last supper when, after the blessing of the bread and wine, he testified, in express and clear words, that he gave them his own very body and his own blood, words which—recorded by the holy evangelist, and afterward repeated by St. Paul, whereas they carry with them that proper and most manifest meaning in which they were understood by the Fathers—it is indeed a crime the most unworthy that they should be wrested, by certain contentious and wicked men, to fictitious and imaginary tropes, whereby the verity of the flesh and blood of Christ is denied, contrary to the universal sense of the Church, which, as *the pillar and ground of truth*, has detested, as Satanical, these inventions devised by impious men; she recognizing, with a mind ever grateful and unforgetting, the most excellent benefit of Christ.[1]

Transubstantiation therefore means this: When the priest pronounces what Dr. Henry More calls the “quinque-verbal charm” (these five words, *Hoc enim est corpus meum*, “for this is my body”) the wafer is no longer wheaten flour and water, but a whole living man, with all his flesh and all his blood; yea, and Christ’s soul and divinity too: a perfect man and a perfect God. Hence the worship of *latria*, which Romanists say is to be offered to God alone, is to be

paid to the host, or consecrated wafer, as the Council of Trent expresses it (Ses. xiii. ch. v.): *Latriae cultum, qui vero Deo debetur.*

Surely the force of error and the debasement of superstition and idolatry can no farther go.

428

As there is not the slightest intimation of this dogma in the Scriptures, and as it contradicts our senses and reason, it may well be asked how it ever was made an article of faith in the Romish Church.

§ 3. Romish Proofs from Scripture Considered.

As a matter of course Romish divines *claim* scriptural warrant for transubstantiation. Does not Christ say, "This is my body," "This is my blood?" He does; but does not every sensible child know that the verb *is*, in Scripture, and also in the common language of all people, often means *represents*? "The seven good kine are seven years; and the seven good ears are seven years." (Gen. xli. 26.) Was ever anybody so stupid as to suppose that the cows and ears of corn which Pharoah saw in his dream were really years? The verb *are*, as everybody knows, means *represent*. So of the paschal lamb it is said (Ex. xii. 11.): "It is the Lord's passover." Does not everybody know that it was not the Passover itself, but a memento of it, and so called by its name? So of "the mystery" (or sacrament, as Romanists render it) of the seven stars and the seven golden candlesticks, it is said (Rev. i. 20): "The seven stars are the angels of the seven Churches; and the seven candlesticks are the seven Churches." Was John so stupid as to imagine that they were any thing but representatives of the angels and the Churches? When a child is pointed to the picture of his father, and he exclaims, "That is my papa!" did ever any one suppose that he was so stupid as to imagine that it was anything but a representation of his father? and especially if his father is present, pointing him to the picture? Had not the apostles sense enough to know that Jesus could not mean that the bread and wine was any thing more than a representation of himself, as he was there present, holding it in his hands, distributing it to them? How could he hold himself in his own hands—body, blood, soul, and divinity—and give his whole self to every one of the apostles to be eaten by every one of them? They

knew very well that he meant, “This represents my body and blood,” which they were to eat and drink in remembrance of him. If it were he himself, the elements would not be a memento of him, as he says they are.

Their reason told them that it was only a representation, not a reality, and their senses confirmed the judgment of their reason.

429

They saw and heard the Saviour in their presence, speaking to them. They saw, heard, touched, smelted, and tasted the elements, and knew very well that they were not flesh, blood, bones, soul, and divinity. They knew very well that they were not cannibals; they had never eaten the blood of beasts, much less of a man, and as to eating a soul and a God, the preposterous and profane conception never entered their minds. They saw and heard Jesus, and knew that they were not eating him. They apprehended the bread and wine by all their senses, and knew very well it was nothing else which they ate and drank. But it is said the senses often deceive us. They do deceive us sometimes, but then we employ our senses to correct the deception. To the sight the artificial flower seems to be a real flower; but, brought to the test of the senses of smell, touch, hearing, and taste, it is instantly perceived that it is but the representation of a flower. So of a thousand other things. Our five senses are given us for the express purpose of putting us in a real, truthful relation with the external world—not to deceive us.

When our Lord wrought his miracles, including his own resurrection, he appealed to the senses of men for a verification of his miracles: “Go and show John again those things which ye do hear and see: the blind receive their sight, and the lame walk,” etc. (Matt. xi. 4, 5); “Reach hither thy finger and behold my hands, and reach hither thy hand and thrust it into my side, and be not faithless, but believing” (John xx. 27). But what would be the use of all this, if we could not depend upon the testimony of our senses? In fact we could not live a day without depending upon their testimony.

If, therefore, the great miracle of transubstantiation had been performed when Christ said, “This is my body,” it must have been cognizable to the senses, as that is the only way in which a miracle can be verified. But this pretended miracle contradicts all the senses at once, as well as the common sense and reason. When the water was changed into wine the transubstantiation was cognizable by the

senses: those who drew it and saw it and smelled it and tasted it knew it was not water, but wine, and they pronounced it a genuine and good article. So in the eucharist the apostles knew that what they drank was not blood, but wine—the juice of the grape, the fruit of the vine. They knew too that what they ate was not flesh, but bread.

430

Hence they always spoke of breaking bread, not eating flesh, in this ordinance; and of drinking wine or the cup (by metonomy of the container for the contained), of which some of the Corinthians drank so freely as to be drunken with it—an effect which never follows from the drinking of blood. The cup of blessing in the Passover was a cup of wine, and it is the same in the eucharist. Thus the apostle speaks, over and over again: “For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord’s death till he come;” “wherefore whosoever shall eat this bread and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord;” “but let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread and drink of that cup.” (I Cor. xi.)

The apostles held that Christ had taken his body and soul to heaven, and that there he must remain till the times of the restitution of all things. (Acts iii. 21.) As we have it in the Creed, “He ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty; from thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead.” The apostles were not scientists, but they had sense enough to know that one and the same finite being, as is Christ’s humanity, cannot be in more places than one at the same time. If he was in heaven, then he could not be at the same time in a million places on the earth. They knew too that a whole is greater than its parts, and consequently that every crumb of the bread and every drop of the wine could not by any miracle be equal to the whole loaf and the entire cup; yet Papists affirm that in every particle of the host and chalice the whole of Christ is contained, or rather that every particle is the whole of Christ—body, blood, soul, and divinity. The apostles never in all their writings intimate the preposterous, unphilosophical conceit that the species, or accidents, of bread and wine may remain, while the substance is utterly changed. On the contrary, they maintain that the substance does remain, and they know that it does by the permanence of the species, and by their natural properties and potential effects. The

bread looks, feels, smells, sounds, tastes like bread, and may be eaten moderately to the nourishment of the body, or immoderately to gluttony; that the wine looks, feels, smells, sounds, tastes like wine, and may be drunk moderately to refreshment, or immoderately to drunkenness, as was the case with the unworthy communicants in the Corinthian

Church. Any animal might eat and drink the elements, and the result would be just the same as if he ate the same amount of ordinary bread and wine. Kept for a certain length of time, and exposed, the bread, like any other bread, would become moldy, the wine sour or evaporated, which could not be the case if the bread and wine were changed into the body and blood of Christ, which cannot see corruption, as the Scriptures assure us.

The apostles understood the Lord's-supper to be a sacrament (though they never use that word), that is, an outward and visible sign of something infinitely higher than itself; and they had sense enough to know that it could not be that which it signified. Hence the article is correct in saying that "transubstantiation cannot be proved by Holy Writ, but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions."

§ 4. Patristic Proofs.

But if Scripture affords no support to this dogma, the Romanists are very confident that the Fathers do. We quote from the Roman Catechism:

Let St. Ambrose first declare his faith. In his book on "The Initiated" he says that the same true body of our Lord, which was assumed of the Virgin, is received in this sacrament; a truth which he declares is to be believed with the certainty of faith: and in another place he distinctly tells us that before consecration it is bread, and after consecration it is the flesh of Christ. St. Chrysostom, another witness of equal fidelity and weight, professes and proclaims this mysterious truth, particularly in his sixtieth homily on those who receive the sacred mysteries unworthily; and also in his forty-fourth and forty-fifth homilies on St. John. "Let us," says he, "obey, not contradict God, although what he says may seem contrary to our reason and our sight; his words cannot deceive, our senses are easily deceived." With the doctrine thus taught by St. Chrysostom that uniformly

taught by St. Augustin fully accords, particularly when in his explanation of the thirty-third Psalm he says: “To carry himself in his own hands is impossible to man, and peculiar to Christ alone; he was carried in his own hands when, giving his body to be eaten, he said, ‘This is my body.’” To pass by Justin and Irenaeus, St. Cyril, in his Fourth Book on St. John, declares in such express terms that the body of our Lord is contained in this sacrament that no sophistry can distort, no captious interpretations obscure, his meaning. Should the pastor wish for additional testimonies of the Fathers, he will find it easy to add the Hilaries, the Jeromes, the Denises, the Damascenes, and a host of other illustrious names, whose sentiments on this most important subject he will find collected by the labor and industry of men eminent for piety and learning.

To all this we reply, first, by *concession*. The Fathers did use

language concerning this sacrament which might very well be used by those who believe in transubstantiation.

But what if they did? Suppose they had used the very word, which they did not, and affirmed the doctrine in plain language, as in the Roman Catechism, which was not the case, it would have been all the worse for them, and none the better for the doctrine or its assertors. We have elsewhere shown that the Fathers erred in many things most egregiously. At one time they nearly all indorsed the heresy of the corporeal reign of Christ on the earth for a thousand years, and the wild vagaries connected with that delusion. They nearly all held superstitious notions of baptism, both with regard to its mode and efficacy, and some of the chief of them, notably Augustin, relegated all unbaptized infants, dying in infancy, to hell. This Father, indeed, wrote a book of Retractations, in which he canceled many of his opinions. Then they warred against each other on almost all questions, just as polemics of various communions do now.

Then, again, they wrote in an inexact, rhetorical style, tumid, obscure, and loose. It is hard to tell what their views really were. One does not know how to reduce to plain English the paradoxes and strained metaphors of which they were so fond, and in which they indulged with so much license when discoursing on the sacraments.

It is further to be noted that when there was no special necessity for the use of guarded language—as in meditations; prayers, hymns, and the like—it was natural for them to indulge in mystic expressions and warm metaphors. Even our Occidental

writers, who are comparatively cold and tame, do this. No one expects to find the precision of a Creed or Catechism in a liturgy or hymnal. Is any one so absurd as to imagine that the two well-known independent divines, Watts and Doddridge, believed in transubstantiation, or the real corporeal presence in any sense? Yet hear how they sing. Watts, in his hymns for the Lord's-supper, abounds in passages like these:

For food he gives his flesh;
He bids us drink his blood.

This soul-reviving wine,
Dear Saviour, is thy blood;
We thank that sacred flesh of thine
For this immortal food.

That sounds like the real corporeal presence and the adoration of the host.

So Doddridge:

Hail, sacred feast, which Jesus makes!
Rich banquet of his flesh and blood!
Thrice happy he who here partakes
That sacred stream, that heavenly food.

We have seen this cited by Romanizers in favor of the real corporeal presence.

And so our own Wesley:

We need not now go up to heaven
To bring the long-sought Saviour down,
Thou art to all already given,
Thou dost e'en now thy banquet crown:
To every faithful soul appear,
And show thy real presence here.

Warm and hyperbolic figures are allowed in liturgies and hymns, and ordinarily no one is misled by them. For more than a century these hymns have been sung by millions who would go to the stake (as transuhstantiation is called "the burning doctrine," so many martyrs have been burned for denying it) rather than profess a dogma so blasphemous and absurd. We shall not allow our liberty to be abridged in this respect, because precisians of our own

communion may stumble at it, and Romanizers may try to make capital out of it. We will not, we cannot, when engaged in the fervent exercises of religious worship, stop to scrutinize every expression and explain every metaphor. A course of this sort would freeze the life out of devotion. What we really mean by such language we are always ready, when occasion occurs, to show to every man that asketh us.

This leads us to reply by *opposition*. We affirm that the Fathers did not believe in transuhstantiation; they never used the word, they did not believe the doctrine.

How could Augustin, *e. g.*, believe it when he wrote as follows:

> If any passage of Scripture seems to command a crime or horrid action, it is figurative, as, "Except ye eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of man, ye have no life in you," which seems to command a crime and a horrid action; and therefore it is a figure commanding us to communicate in the passion of our Lord, and to lay up in our memory with delight and profit that his flesh was crucified and wounded for us. (*De Sac. Chris.*, iii. 16.)

How could Origen, the learned Father of the Greek Church,

believe it when he said, "The understanding of our Saviour's words of eating his flesh and drinking his blood, according to the letter, is a letter that killeth?"

After showing by extended presumptive proofs that the Fathers believed no such doctrine, Bishop Burnet says:

> So far I have gone upon the presumptions that may be offered to prove that this doctrine was not known to the ancients. They are not only just and lawful presumptions, but they are so strong and violent that when they are well considered they force an assent to that which we infer from them. I go next to the more plain and direct proofs that we find of the opinion of the ancients in this matter.
>
> They call the elements bread and wine after the consecration. Justin Martyr calls them *bread and wine, and a nourishment which nourished*; he indeed says it is not *common bread and wine*, which shows that he thought it was still so in substance; and he illustrates the sanctification of the elements by the incarnation of Christ, in which the human nature did not lose or change its substance by its union with the divine: so the bread and the wine do not, according to that explanation, lose their proper substance when they become the flesh and blood of Christ.
>
> Irenaeus calls it *that bread over which thanks are given*, and says it is *no more common bread, but the eucharist consisting of two things, an earthly and a*

heavenly.

Tertullian, arguing against the Marcionites, who held two gods, and that the Creator of this earth was the bad god, but that Christ was contrary to him, urges against them this, that Christ made use of the creatures; and says, *he did not reject bread by which he represents his own body*; and in another place he says, *Christ calls bread his body*, that from thence you may understand *that he gave the figure of his body to the bread.*

Origen says, *We eat of the loaves that are set before us, which by prayer are become a certain holy body that sanctifies those who use them with a sound purpose.*

St. Cyprian says, *Christ calls the bread that was compounded of many grains his body, and the wine that is pressed out of many grapes his blood, to shew the union of his people.* And in another place, writing against those who used only water, but no wine, in the eucharist, he says, *We cannot see the blood by which we are redeemed, when wine is not in the chalice, by which the blood is shewed.*

Epiphanius being to prove that man may be said to be made after the image of God, though he is not like him, urges this, *That the bread is not like Christ, neither in his invisible Deity, nor in his incarnate likeness, for it is round and without feeling as to its virtue.*

Gregory Nyssen says. *The bread in the beginning is common; but after the mystery has consecrated it, it is said to be, and is, the body of Christ*: to this he compares the sanctification of the mystical oil, of the water in baptism, and the stones of an altar, or church, dedicated to God.

St. Ambrose calls it still bread, and says, this *bread is made the food of the saints.*

St. Chrysostom on these words, *the bread that we break,* says, *What is the bread? The body of Christ. What are they made to be who take it? The body of Christ.* Which shows that he considered the bread as being so the body of Christ, as the worthy receivers became his body; which is done, not by a change of substance, but by a sanctification of their natures.

St. Jerome says, *Christ took bread, that as Melchisedec had in the figure offered bread and wine, he might also represent the truth*

(that is in opposition to the figure) *of his body and blood.*

St. Augustin does very largely compare the sacraments being called the body and blood of Christ, with those other places in which the Church is called his body, and all Christians are his members: which shews that he thought the one was to be understood mystically as well as the other. He calls the eucharist frequently our daily bread, and the sacrament of bread and wine. All these call the eucharist *bread and wine* in express words: but when they call it *Christ's body and blood,* they call it so *after a sort,* or that *it is said to be,* or with some other mollifying expression.

St. Augustin says this plainly, *After some sort the sacrament of the body*

of Christ is his body, and the sacrament of his blood is the blood of Christ; he carried himself in his own hands in some sort, when he said, This is my body.

St. Chrysostom says, *The bread is thought worthy to be called the body of our Lord*: and in another place, reckoning up the improper senses of the word *flesh*, he says, the Scriptures used to call the *mysteries* (that is, the sacrament) *by the name of flesh, and sometimes the whole Church is said to be the body of Christ.*

So Tertullian says, *Christ calls the bread his body, and names the bread by his body.*

The fathers do not only call the consecrated elements bread and wine; they do also affirm that they retain their proper nature and substance, and are the same thing as to their nature that they were before. And the occasion upon which the passages, that I go next to mention, are used by them, does prove this matter beyond contradiction.

Apollinaris did broach that heresy which was afterward put in full form by Eutyches; and that had so great a party to support it, that as they had one general council (a pretended one at least) to favor them, so they were condemned by another. Their error was that the human nature of Christ was swallowed up by the divine, if not while he was here on earth, yet at least after his ascension to heaven. This error was confuted by several writers who lived very wide one from another, and at a distance of above a hundred years one from another. St. Chrysostom at Constantinople, Theodoret in Asia, Ephrem patriarch of Antioch, and Gelasius bishop of Rome. All those write to prove that the human nature did still remain in Christ, not changed nor swallowed up, but only sanctified by the divine nature that was united to it. They do all fall into one argument, which very probably those who came after St. Chrysostom took from him: so that though both Theodoret and Gelasius's words are much fuller, yet because the argument is the same with that which St. Chrysostom had urged against Apollinaris, I shall first set down his words. He brings an illustration from the doctrine of the sacrament to show that the human nature was not destroyed by its union with the divine, and has upon that these words, *As before the bread is sanctified, we call it bread, but when the divine grace has sanctified it by the means of the priest, it is freed from the name of bread, and is thought worthy of the name of the Lord's body, though the nature of bread remain in it: and yet it is not said there are two bodies, but one body of the Son: so the divine nature being joined to the body, both these make one Son and one Person.*

Ephrem of Antioch says, *The body of Christ received by the faithful does not depart from its sensible substance: so baptism,* says he, *does not lose its own sensible substance, and does not lose that which it was before.*

436

Theodoret says, *Christ does honor the symbols with the name of his body and blood; not changing the nature, but adding grace to nature.* In another place,

pursuing the same argument, he says, *The mystical symbols after the sanctifmtion do not depart from their own nature: for they continue in their former substance, figure, and form, and are visible and palpable as they were before, but they are understood to be that which they are made.*

Pope Gelasius says, *The sacraments of the body and blood of Christ are a divine thing; for which reason we became by them partakers of the divine nature: and yet the substance of bread and wine does not cease to exist; and the image and likeness of the body and blood of Christ are celebrated in holy mysteries.* Upon all these places being compared with the design with which they were written, which was to prove that Christ's human nature did still subsist, unchanged, and not swallowed up by its union with the divinity, some reflections are very obvious: first, if the corporal presence of Christ in the sacrament had been then received in the Church, the natural and unavoidable argument in this matter, which must put an end to it, with all that believed such corporal presence, was this: Christ has certainly a natural body still, because the bread and wine are turned to it; and they cannot be turned to that which is not. In their writings they argued against the possibility of a substantial change of a human nature into the divine; but that could not have been urged by men who believed a substantial mutation to be made in the sacrament; for then the Eutychians might have retorted the argument with great advantage upon them.

The Eutychians did make use of some expressions that were used by some in the Church, which seemed to import that they did argue from the sacrament, as Theodoret represents their objections. But to that he answers, as we have seen, denying that any such substantial change was made. The design of those fathers was to prove, that things might be united together, and continue so united, without a change of their substances, and that this was true in the two natures in the person of Christ; and to make this more sensible, they bring in the matter of the sacrament, as a thing known and confessed; for in their arguing upon it they do suppose it as a thing out of dispute.

Now, according to the Roman doctrine, this had been a very odd sort of an argument, to prove that Christ's human nature was not swallowed up of the divine; because the mysteries or elements in the sacrament are changed into the *substance of Christ's body, only they retain the outward appearance of bread and wine.*

To this a Eutychian might readily have answered, that then the human nature might be believed to be destroyed; and though Christ had appeared in that likeness, he retained only the accidents of human nature; but that the human nature itself was destroyed, as the *bread* and the *wine* were destroyed in the eucharist.

This had been a very absurd way of arguing in the Fathers, and had indeed delivered up the cause to the Eutychians: whereas those Fathers make it an argument against them, to prove, that notwithstanding a union

of two beings, and such a union as did communicate a sanctification from the one to the other, yet the two *natures* might remain still distinguished; and that it was so in the eucharist therefore it might be so in the person of Christ. This seems to be so evident an indication of the doctrine of the whole Church in the fourth and fifth centuries, when so many of the most eminent writers of those ages do urge it so home as an argument in so great a point, that we can scarce think it possible for any

man to consider it fully without being determined by it. And so far we have considered the authorities from the Fathers, to shew that they believed that the substance of bread and wine did still remain in the sacrament.

Another head of proof is, that they affirm that our bodies are nourished by the sacrament, which shews very plainly that they had no notion of a change of substance made in it.

Justin Martyr calls the eucharist that food by which our flesh and blood, through its transmutation into them, are nourished.

Irenaeus makes this an argument for the resurrection of our bodies, that they are fed by the body and blood of Christ: *When the cup and the bread receives the word of God it becomes the eucharist of the body and blood of Christ, by which the substance of our flesh is increased and subsists*: and he adds, *that the flesh is nourished by the body and blood of Christ, and is made his member*.

Tertullian says, *The flesh is fed with the body and blood of Christ.*

Origen explains this very largely on those words of Christ, *It is not that which enters within a man that defiles the man*: he says, if every thing that goes into the belly is cast into the draught, then *that food which is sanctified by the word of God, and by prayer, goes also info the belly, as to that which is material in it, and goes from thence into the draught.* And a little after he adds, *It is not the matter of the bread, but the word, that is pronounced over it, which profits him that eats it, in such a way as is not unworthy of the Lord.*

The bishops of Spain, in a council that sat at Toledo in the seventh century, condemned those that began to consecrate round wafers, and did not offer one entire loaf in the eucharist, and appointed, for so much of the bread as remained after the communion, that either it should be put in some bag, or if it was needful to eat it up, that *it might not oppress the belly of him, that took it with an overcharging burden, and that it might not go into the digestion; they fancying that a lesser quantity made no digestion, and produced no excrement.*

In the ninth century both Rabanus Maurus and Heribald believed that the sacrament was so digested that some part of it turned to excrement, which was also held by divers writers of the Greek Church, whom their adversaries called, by way of reproach, *Stercoranists*. Others, indeed, of the ancients did think that no part of the sacrament became excrement, but that it was spread through the whole substance of the communicant, for the

good of body and soul. Both Cyril of Jerusalem, St. Chrysostom, and John Damascene, fell into this conceit; but still they thought that it was changed into the substance of our bodies, and so nourished them without any excrement coming from any part of it.

The fathers do call the consecrated elements the *figures*, the *signs*, the *symbols*, the *types*, and *antitypes*, the *commemoration*, the *representation*, the *mysteries*, and the *sacraments*, of the body and blood; which does evidently demonstrate, that they could not think that they were the very substance of his body and blood. Tertullian, when he is proving that Christ had a true body, and was not a phantasm, argues thus, *He made bread to be his body, saying, This is my body; that is, the figure of my body*: from which he argues, that since his body had that for its *figure*, it was a true body; for an empty thing, such as a phantasm is, cannot have a *figure*. It is from hence clear, that it was not then believed that Christ's body was literally in the sacrament; for otherwise the argument would have been much clearer and shorter: Christ has a *true body*, because we believe that the sacrament is truly his

body, than to go and prove it so far about, as to say a phantasm has no figure; but the sacrament is the figure of Christ's body, therefore it is no phantasm.

St. Austin says, *He commended and gave to his disciples the figure of his body and blood.* And when the Manicheans objected to him that *blood* is called in the Old Testament the *life* or *soul*, contrary to what is said in the New; he answers that *blood* was not the *soul* or *life*, but only the sign of it; and that the sign sometimes bears the name of that of which it is the sign: so says he, *Christ did not doubt to say, This is my body, when he was giving the sign of his body.* Now that had been a very bad argument, if the bread was truly the body of Christ; it had proved that the sign must be one with the thing signified.

The whole ancient liturgies, and all the Greek fathers, do so frequently use the words *type, antitype, sign*, and *mystery*, that this is not so much as denied; it is their constant style. Now it is apparent that a thing cannot be the type and symbol of itself. And though they had more frequent occasions to speak of the eucharist than either of baptism or the chrism; yet as they called the *water* and the *oil types* and *mysteries*, so they bestowed the same descriptions on the elements in the eucharist; and as they have many strong expressions concerning the *water* and the *oil* that cannot be literally understood, so upon the same grounds it will appear reasonable to give the same exposition to some high expressions that they fell into concerning this sacrament. Facundus has some very full discourses to this purpose: he is proving that Christ may be called the *adopted Son of God*, as well as he is truly *his Son*, and that because he was baptized. *The sacrament of adoption, that is baptism, may be called baptism, as the sacrament of his body and blood,*

which is in the consecrated bread and cup, is called his body and blood: not that the bread is properly his body, or the cup properly his blood; but because they contain in them the mystery of his body and blood. St. Austin says, *That sacraments must have some resemblance of those things of which they are the sacraments: so the sacrament of the body of Christ is after some manner his body; and the sacrament of his blood is after some manner his blood.* And speaking of the eucharist as a sacrifice of praise, he says, *The flesh and blood of this sacrifice was promised before the coming of Christ, by the sacrifices that were the types of it. In the passion the sacrifice was truly offered; and after his ascension it is celebrated by the sacrament of the remembrance of it.* And when he speaks of the murmuring of the Jews, upon our Saviour's speaking of giving his flesh to them, to eat it; he adds. *They foolishly and carnally thought that he was to cut off some parcels of his body, to be given to them: but he shows that there was a sacrament hid there.* And he thus paraphrases that passage. *The words that I have spoken to you, they are spirit and life: understand spiritually that which I have said; for it is not this body which you see, that you are to eat, or to drink this blood which they shall shed, who crucify me. But I have recommended a sacrament to you, which being spiritually understood, shall quicken you: and though it be necessary that it be celebrated visibly, yet it must be understood invisibly.*

Primasius compares the sacrament to a pledge, which a dying man leaves to any one whom he loved. But that which is more important than the quotation of any of the words of the Fathers is, that the author of the books of the sacrament, which pass under the name of St. Ambrose, though it is generally agreed that those books were writ some ages after his death, gives us the prayer of consecration, as it was used in his time: he calls it the *heavenly words*, and sets it down. The offices of the Church are a clearer evidence of the doctrine in that Church than all the discourses that can be made by any doctor in it; the one is the language

of the whole body, whereas the other are only the private reasonings of particular men: and, of all the parts of the office, the prayer of consecration is that which does most certainly set out to us the sense of that Church that used it. But what which makes this remark the more important is, that the prayer, as set down by this pretended St. Ambrose, is very near the same with that which is now in the canon of the *mass*; only there is one very important variation, which will best appear by setting both down.

That of St. Ambrose is, *Fac nobis hanc oblationem, ascriptam, rationabilem, acceptabilem, quod est figura corporis et sanguinis Domini nostri Jesu Christi, qui pridie quam pateretur*, etc. That in the canon of the mass is, *Quam oblationem tu Deus in omnibus quae sumus benedictam, ascriptam, ratam, rationabilem, acceptabilemque facere digneris: ut nobis corpus et sanguis fiat dilectissimi Filii tui Domini nostri Jesu Christi.*

We do plainly see so great a resemblance of the latter to the former of

these two prayers, that we may well conclude that the one was begun in the other; but at the same time we observe an essential difference. In the former this sacrifice is called the *figure of the body and blood of Christ.* Whereas in the latter it is prayed, that *it may become to us the body and blood of Christ.* As long as the former was the prayer of consecration, it is not possible for us to imagine that the doctrine of the corporal presence could be received; for that which was believed to be the *true body and blood of Christ* could not be called, especially in such a part of the office, *the figure of his body and blood*; and therefore the change that was made in this prayer was an evident proof of a change in the doctrine; and if we could tell in what age that was done, we might then upon greater certainty fix the time in which this change was made, or at least in which the inconsistency of that prayer with this doctrine was observed.

I have now set down a great variety of proofs reduced under different heads; from which it appears evidently that the Fathers did not believe this doctrine, but that they did affirm the contrary very expressly. This sacrament continued to be so long considered as the figure or image of Christ's body, that the Seventh General Council, which met at Constantinople in the year 754, and consisted of above three hundred and thirty bishops, when it condemned the worship of images, affirmed this was the only image that we might lawfully have of Christ; and that he had appointed us to offer *this image of his body*, to wit, the *substance of the bread.* That was indeed contradicted with much confidence by the Second Council of Nice, in which, in opposition to what appears to this day in all the Greek liturgies, and the Greek Fathers, they do positively deny that the sacrament was ever called the *image of Christ*: and they affirm it to be the *true body of Christ.*[2]

§ 5. Further Roman Proofs.

But though the Scriptures and the Fathers are chary in giving support to this doctrine, Romanists are not discouraged. The Catechism says:

Another means of ascertaining the belief of the Church on matters of faith, is the condemnation of the contrary doctrine. That the belief of the real presence was that of the Universal Church of God, unanimously professed by all her children, is demonstrated by a well-authenticated fact. When in the eleventh century

Berengarius presumed to deny this dogma, asserting that the eucharist was only a sign, the innovation was immediately condemned by the unanimous voice of the Christian world. The Council of Vercelli, convened by authority

of Leo. IX., denounced the heresy, and Berengarius himself retracted and anathematized his error. Relapsing, however, into the same infatuation and impiety, he was condemned by three different Councils, convened, one at Tours, the other two at Rome; of the two latter, one was summoned by Nicholas II., the other by Gregory VII. The General Council of Lateran, held under Innocent III., further ratified the sentence; and the faith of the Catholic Church, on this point of doctrine, was more fully declared and more firmly established in the Councils of Florence and Trent.

To this we reply first by concession. These Councils did declare and establish this dogma; and it is all the worse for the Councils that they did so. It was not the only bad thing that they did, but one can conceive of scarcely any thing worse.

But then we also reply by positive denial. This dogma never was "the belief of the universal Church of God, unanimously professed by all her children." It requires great hardihood to make such an assertion.

The Greek Church never has believed in transubstantiation and the adoration of the host, though it holds to a kind of consubstantiation. Some of the late Greek Fathers, indeed, use the terms *μεταβολή* and *μεταστοιχείωσις*. The former word means simply change, and proves nothing; the latter is literally change of the elements. Romanists render the verb *transelementare*, and insist that it means *transubstantiate*. Suidas says it means the same as *μετασχηματίζε, μεταπλάττω*, to transfigure, to transform. But Papists themselves admit of no change in the form; the species still remain. Suicer says, *transelementare* will not express the sense. Jeremy Taylor cites the Jesuit Suarez as admitting that *μεταστοιχείωσις* does not convey the meaning of transubstantiation. Gregory Nyssen says: "These things he gives by virtue of the benediction upon it, transmuting the nature of the things which appear." Theophylact, the last of the Greek Fathers (A.D. 1077), says: "The merciful God, condescending to us, preserves the form of bread and wine, but changes them into the virtue of his flesh and blood." But as Bishop Browne well says,

> Gregory is speaking not only of a change in the eucharist, but in the sacraments generally; and whatever sanctifying efficacy may have been attributed to the water in baptism, no change of the substance was ever believed to take place. Theophylact only says that the elements are changed into the *virtue* or *efficacy*, not into the *substance*, of Christ's flesh and blood —a very notable distinction. He

uses the same word of change very unlike transubstantiation, *e. g.*, the change of our bodies to the state of incorruption, and the change that is made in the faithful when they are united to Christ. We shall find abundant proof from Greek Fathers, centuries before Theophylact, to show that a conversion of substance was not believed by the early Greek Church; and therefore that Theophylact's transelementation must have meant something else, or that he himself must have adopted comparatively modern views.

He shows that Cyril's language, "His body is given to thee in the figure of bread, and his blood in the figure of wine," is to be understood in a spiritual sense, as Cyril himself explains it in opposition to the carnal views of the Capharnaite Jews, who understood our Lord's words as implying a *σαρχοφαγία*, or eating of flesh. A famous passage, attributed by Romanists to Cyprian, which speaks of the bread as "changed not in form, but in nature," was not written by him: it is assigned by the Benedictine editors to Arnoldus, of Bona Vallis, a contemporary of St. Bernard, A.D. 1115. But even this does not necessarily imply transubstantiation. As Cranmer says, it only implies that

> There is added thereto another higher property, nature, and condition, far passing the nature and condition of common bread, that is to say that the bread doth show unto us, as the same Cyprian saith, that we be partakers of the Spirit of God, and most purely joined unto Christ, and spiritually fed with his flesh and blood: so that now the said mystical bread is both a corporal food for the body, and a spiritual food for the soul.

This may savor of consubstantiation, but it is not transubstantiation. However, no matter what it means, Cyprian did not say it; and a great many worse things were said in the twelfth century.

§ 6. History of the Dogma.

From the incautious language of the Fathers, and the growth of superstition during the Dark Ages, one may readily see how this dogma gradually crystallized into its Tridentine form.

Bishop Beveridge has very well epitomized the history of this dogma:

> Scripture and Fathers holding forth so clearly that whosoever worthily receives the sacrament of the Lord's-supper doth certainly partake of the body and blood of Christ, the devil there took occasion to draw men into an

opinion that the bread which is used in that sacrament is the very body that was crucified upon the cross, and the wine after consecration the very blood that gushed out of his pierced side. The time when this opinion was first broached was in the days of Gregory III., Pope of Rome [in the eighth century]. The persons that were the principal abettors of it were Damascene in the Eastern and afterward Amalarius in the Western Churches. It was no sooner started in the East, but it was opposed

by a famous Council at Constantinople, consisting of three hundred and thirty-eight bishops, the famous opposers of idol worship. But afterward in the Second Council of Nice, it was again defended, and in particular by Epiphanius the deacon, who confidently affirmed that, "after the consecration, the bread and wine are called, are, and are believed to be, properly the body and blood of Christ." In the West also Amalarius, having broached this opinion, Paschasius Radbertus readily swallowed it down. But Rabanus Maurus, Ratraranus or Bertramnus, as also Johannes Scotus Erigena, not only struck at it, but refused it, and wrote against it as a poisonous error. And after them Berengarius too, who was not only written against by Lanfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury, but condemned for it at a council held at Vercelli (where the book of Johannes Scotus of the eucharist was also condemned), and at another Council held at Rome about the same time. And though he did recant his opinion at a Council held at Tours, and another at Rome as some think, so as never to hold it more, yet his followers would never recant what they had learned of him. But in the Lateran Council, held A.D. 1215, the opinion of the real or carnal presence of Christ was not only confirmed, but the word *transubstantiated* was newly coined to express it by.

Hagenbach says:

Hildebert of Tours [A.D. 1055–1134] was the first who made use of the full-sounding term *transubstantiatio*, though similar expressions, such as *transitio*, had previously been employed. Most of the earlier scholastics, and the disciples of Lanfranc in particular, had defended the doctrine of the change of the bread into the body of Christ, and the doctrine of the *accidentia sine subjecto*; these were now solemnly confirmed, by being inserted *together with* the term *transubstantiatio*, into the *Decretum Gratiani*, and were made an unchangeable article of faith by Pope Innocent III.

But the Schoolmen and Romanists admit that before the Council of Lateran, which adopted the word, the dogma of transubstantiation was not an article of faith. Hence the persistent opposition to it (as to the immaculate conception of the Virgin and the infallibility of the Pope) until it was established as a dogma by that Council. The Anglo-Saxon Church stood out long against it.

Thus Aelfric, Archbishop of Canterbury, in his *Paschal Homily*, written in both Latin and Saxon, declares against the papal doctrine of transubstantiation.

St. Bernard (A.D. 1115) recognized no feeding in the eucharist but a spiritual feeding. Even Peter Lombard, Master of the Sentences (1141), declines to say whether the conversion of the bread and wine be formal or substantial, or some other kind. And Thomas Aquinas, forty years after the Council, speaks of Christ's body as present, not bodily, but substantially, whatever that may mean.[3]

443

It would be bootless to adduce the opinions of the Schoolmen, and the subtleties by which they vainly endeavored to expound this dogma, and make it quadrate with Scripture, reason, and common sense.

As everybody knows, it was one of the great test doctrines in the time of the Reformation. Thousands of Protestants were burned at the stake for denying that the wafer was the body, blood, soul, and divinity of Christ, and for refusing to give it divine honors.

§ 7. The Superstitions Engendered.

The article says this doctrine "hath given occasion to many superstitions."

"How zealous are they," says Beveridge, speaking of the host, "in wrapping it up neatly in their handkerchiefs, laying it up in their treasures, carrying it about in their processions, yea, and at the length, in worshiping and adoring it too!" Burnet well remarks:

> That it has given occasion to abominable idolatry is evident from the adoration of the host, which is grounded on it. But though idolatry is worse than superstition, yet it is different from it. Wherefore, for the proof of this branch of the proposition let it be considered that in cases of imminent danger or great calamities, the host is *exposed* by the Papists, to appease God's anger, and prevent or remove his judgments; or reference may be had to the perversions made in the Romish Church, in the event of any accident happening to the consecrated elements. Those who have not studied this subject will be astounded at the puerile and impious superstitions which Romanists have concreted around this dogma. Only think that the question of Stercorianism—we revolt at the abominable word—was discussed with great earnestness and zeal by Romish doctors in former times. Paschasius

held that the bread and wine in the sacrament are not under the same laws with our food, as they pass into our flesh and substance without any evacuation.

Others held that the species were annihilated; others, that they have a perpetual being; others, that they are changed into flesh and blood, and not voided; others, that they are the body, blood, soul, and divinity of Christ, subjected to such a process. The Roman Missal says that a consecration is invalid when a priest has eleven wafers, and intends to consecrate only ten, not determining what ten he proposes to consecrate. Not a single wafer

is turned into the body of Christ unless the priest has the *intention* to effect the transubstantiation. Thus, as no one knows what is the intention of the priest, no one knows whether he is receiving a mere wafer or the body, blood, soul, and divinity of Christ. Those who want to know to what degraded superstitions this dogma has caused the Romanists to sink are referred to the "Theology" of Peter Dens, a teacher of theology in the University of Louvain, a noted Romish institution. The work of Dens is designed for theological students, and has long been a text-book in the College at Maynooth. The Roman Missal "Respecting Defects in the Mass," may also be examined. Extracts from these works are given in Elliott's "Delineation of Roman Catholicism," Book II., chapters iv., v.

§ 8. Lutheran Consubstantiation.

The third paragraph of this article reads: "The body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper, only after a heavenly and spiritual manner. And the means whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper, is faith."

We have seen that this paragraph took the place of one in the previous article as set forth in the time of Edward, which explicitly repudiated "the real and bodily presence;" and for that reason it is thought the substitution was made, so as not to offend those who held to the corporeal presence. But these could not have been Papists, because the article denounces their great dogma of transubstantiation. The revisers, it is thought, may have had in view the Lutherans who believed in consubstantiation; but it is difficult to see how even that could be the case.

Luther held that though the elements are not changed into the real body and blood of Christ, yet the latter are united through the consecration with the former, and are received under them in the sacrament. He held the notion of the Schoolmen *de praesentia reali et substantiali*, that *in, with*, and *under* (*in, cum*, and *sub*) the bread and wine, the true and essential body and blood of Christ, are imparted to the communicant, and are received by him, although in a manner inexplicable by us, and altogether mysterious. The Swiss Reformers held that the body of Christ is received spiritually, which Luther fiercely denounced, holding that it was received *realiter et substantialiter*, so that both believing and unbelieving communicants partake of the real, substantial body and blood of Christ, the former to their salvation, the

latter to their condemnation. The bread and wine are received visibly and naturally, the body and blood invisibly and supernaturally; and this is the *unio sacramentalis*, which takes place only in the eucharist, which he illustrates by the simile of heated iron. He held that what the bread and wine do or have done to them, the same is done by or is done to the body and blood of Christ; they are broken, poured out, distributed, eaten, and drunk. Luther insisted upon a literal interpretation of the words of Christ, and consequently upon the actual reception with the mouth of the glorified body of Christ present in the bread, and of his real blood. "Luther was led logically," says Hagenbach, "to the theory of the integrity of Christ's body, which, however, he did not propound till a later period of his life." The idea of ubiquity, however, was for a long time a fluctuating one. If the body of Christ was everywhere, it was in all bread; and so nothing was proved for the specific ubiquity in the Lord's-supper. It really seems incredible that such a man as Luther should hold opinions so preposterous; or, allowing for his apparently insane and headstrong temper, that any should be found to embrace them. Yet his followers denounced Calixtus as a heretic because he called the Ubiquitarian controversy "an unfortunate dispute." Brentius, after Luther's death, gave prominence to the Ubiquitarian conceit, in order to bolster up the doctrine of consubstantiation. Melanchthon opposed it, as making confusion in the two natures of Christ, as did the Universities of Leipsic and Wittenberg. But Flacius Illyricus, Osiander, and other leading Lutherans, as Musculus, Chemnitius, and Chytraeus,

adopted this view, some of them holding a conference in 1577, in the monastery of Berg, and composing a creed in which Ubiquitarianism was the leading article. The Ubiquitarians, however, were not agreed among themselves, some holding that Christ during his mortal life was everywhere in his body, and others dating its ubiquity from the time of his ascension.

This is truly a humiliating chapter in the history of the Reformation. We wish we could expunge it from the record. Luther really seems to have been deranged on this subject. Think of the Reformer writing down the word, ἐστί, *est*, "This *is* my body," and shouting over it, as if Zuinglius or any one else could be convinced by such popish puerility. And then, how absurd is his notion that omnipotence can multiply the body of Christ,

or make it really and substantially present in many places at once!

Consubstantiation overthrows the nature of a sacrament, as obviously as transubstantiation; and, like it, is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, and has given occasion to many superstitions. It can hardly be supposed, therefore, that this paragraph of the article was designed to conciliate the Lutherans who held it. This is the more obvious from the rubric at the end of the Communion Service, where, referring to kneeling at the Lord's-supper, it is declared:

> Thereby no adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the sacramental bread or wine, there bodily received, or unto any corporal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood. For the sacramental bread and wine remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored (for that were idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians). And the natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven, and not here; it being against the truth of Christ's natural body to be at one time in more places than one.[4]

This is a death-blow to both transubstantiation and consubstantiation.

§ 9. Calvin's Theory of the Spiritual Presence.

As the article is equally opposed to Romish transubstantiation and Lutheran consubstantiation, it is thought by many to have been framed to correspond with Calvin's theory of the spiritual presence.

Zuinglius and Carlstadt held that the bread and wine are only memorials of that sacrifice which was once offered on the cross; the bread and wine are signs of what is absent, and their use must be to excite the remembrance of it; therefore the Lord's-supper becomes, instead of a charm, a mental exercise, and the efficacy of it arises not *ex opere operato*, but *ex opere operantis*. This view might be held, and is held, by many of the Reformed Churches and not a few divines of the English Church, in such a way as to comprehend the full scriptural character and design of this sacrament, and may be shown to agree with this article. But Socinians and others hold it, or expound it, in such a way as to make the sacrament a "bare sign," having a natural fitness to produce salutary emotions in the communicant.

Consequently Calvin set forth what he considered a *via media*,

a middle way, between the Lutheran and Zuinglian theories. He held that "the body and blood of Christ are not, *as to their substance*, present in the sacramental elements, but only as to *force* and *effect*; they are *vere et efficaciter* represented under the bread and wine; *dari non substantiam corporis Christi in sacra coena sed omnia quae in suo corpore nobis beneficia praestitit.*"

According to this the body and blood of Christ are not present in space, and are not really received, but *spiritually*, with a kind of *manducatio spiritualis*. Hagenbach says:

> In Calvin's view it is only the believer who is united with Christ in the sacrament; and the body of Christ, as such is not in the bread, but in heaven, from whence in a mysterious and dynamic way it is imparted to the communicant (ii. 309).

This seems to correspond to the "heavenly and spiritual manner," and the reception by "faith" set forth in the article. The body of Christ is in heaven, but a dynamic influence comes forth from it, by his spiritual presence, which is realized only by the believing communicant.

It is very difficult to state the exact *differentia* of Calvin's view; his mystical, spiritual presence of the body and blood is very nebulous. It may be doubted whether he or his followers had any clear idea of what he intended. He could not indorse the corporeal presence, and he was not satisfied with a symbolical presence; so be set forth the spiritual presence.

But a Zuinglian can very well embrace all the appreciable truth

contained in Calvin's view, without the cloud of mysticism which surrounds it. The body of Christ is in no intelligible sense present except by representation; but the faithful communicant, by the symbols, has his mind lifted up to the contemplation of the thing signified; his faith lays hold upon the atoning sacrifice here represented. Christ is present in the power of his spirit, and so by a spiritual manducation, as our Lord expresses it, the faithful communicant eats the flesh and drinks the blood of Christ. This is what the apostle meant by the communion of the body and blood of Christ in this ordinance.

By faith his flesh we eat,
Who thus his passion show.
And God, out of his holy seat.
Doth all his gifts bestow.

When stripped of mystical representations and nebulous metaphors,

nothing is plainer and more simple than this ordinance. We eat and drink bread and wine, as Christ commanded us, in remembrance of him, and our faith lays hold upon his atoning sacrifice thus shown forth, and we receive the remission of sins and all other benefits of his passion. We, indeed, live by this faith, we exercise it every day; but, as we have seen, it is wonderfully quickened and strengthened, when we are engaged in this affecting and impressive service.

§ 10. Elevation and Worship of the Elements.

The last paragraph of the article reads thus: "The sacrament of the Lord's-supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshiped." The meaning is that the elements in the sacrament were not to be reserved, etc.

There is not a syllable in the New Testament about any of these superstitions.

The reserving of the elements began at a very early date, and so also the sending of them to absent members. Justin Martyr (A.D. 140) is the first who mentions this custom. In his "Second Apology" he says the same eucharist which was received by them that were present was sent by the deacons to the absent. Eusebius ("Ec. His.,"

vi. 44) cites a letter of Dionysius of Alexandria, in which he says that Serapion, a penitent lying at the point of death, sent his grandson to the presbyter to absolve him and give him the eucharist. The presbyter was sick; and Dionysius says: "I gave the boy a small portion of the eucharist, telling him to dip it in water, and to drop it into the mouth of the old man. The boy moistened it, and at the same time dropped it into the old man's mouth." The presbyters kept a portion of the consecrated elements in the church to send it to those who were in prison, sick, or otherwise prevented from attendance at the celebration of the eucharist. Thus early did superstition gather around this ordinance. (See Bingham's "Antiquities," xv. 4.)

But objectionable as was this custom, it was very different from that of the Papists, who put the wafer in the pix, keep it in a "sanctuary," exhibit it on the altar, carry it ostentatiously under a canopy, demanding of all who see it to bow down and worship it as a God.

Sick persons and prisoners ought not to be deprived of the

privilege of communion; but then they ought to have the privilege of enjoying the sacramental service, which often proves a great comfort to persons so situated.

The superstition of reserving the elements leads to the idolatry of worshiping them. Against this the Church of England has a rubric conforming to the present article:

> And if any of the bread and wine remain unconsecrated, the curate shall have it to his own use; but if any remain of that which was consecrated, it shall not be carried out of the Church, but the priest, and such other of the communicants as he shall then call unto him, shall, immediately after the blessing, reverently eat and drink the same.

Our Church has very properly omitted this rubric. It is easy to see how it might be abused, to a Corinthian scandal. Besides, this post-communion eating and drinking seems to recognize a sanctity in the "consecrated" elements remaining after the communion; if not, why not dispose of the *reliquiae* as ordinary food? It is not pretended that this post-communion eating and drinking is sacramental; then what is it but ordinary eating and drinking? and why should this be required if there were not a lingering superstition in regard to the consecrated elements? Thus the very rubric which was leveled against the superstition of reserving and

worshiping the elements, and conveying them away to be used as amulets, fosters the superstitious regard for them out of which the evils in question originated.

If this eating and drinking is ordered to prevent an improper use of them, it is only necessary to say that it is more adapted to lead to abuse than to prevent it. We have been administering the eucharist for between forty and fifty years; we have done it hundreds of times, and we never have known any scandal originate in the removal of the *reliquiae* by a minister, deacon, or steward.

In the face of the rubric forbidding the *reliquiae* to be taken out of the Church, Canon Carter (a noted Ritualist) defends the reservation of the sacrament to be carried to the sick (as well as the unction of the sick) on the ground that it was prescribed in the First Prayer Book of Edward VI., and though omitted in she Second Book, it is nowhere prohibited. Carry out that principle, and you will have the Romish eucharistic vestments, incense, bowings, and genuflections, and all the paraphernalia of popery. We are devoutly thankful for deliverance from all such ambiguous

and self-contradictory legislation. Our trumpet gives no uncertain sound.

As to the elevation of the elements, there is not a syllable concerning it in the New Testament nor in the Fathers. Bingham (xv. 8) proves that Germanus, Bishop of Constantinople (A.D. 715), was the first among the Greeks, and Ivo Carnotensis, in the eleventh century, the first among the Latins, to speak of the elevation of the host; but this elevation was designed to express the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ, not for adoration. Daille says that Gulielmus Durantus was the first writer who spoke of elevation for adoration, about A.D. 1386. This was shortly after the dogma of transubstantiation was established, so that, as Bingham says, "mother and daughter came within an age of one another." The most learned Papists admit that the elevation and adoration did not obtain till about the twelfth century.

It is hardly necessary to say that the simple lifting up of the bread and wine in the administration, to fix the minds of communicants upon them, so as to realize "the thing signified," which we frequently do, is not the elevation here repudiated.

1. The text of this passage, which Dr. Summers indicated but did not transcribe, I have taken from Schaff's "Creeds of Christendom," Vol. II., pp. 126, 127, where the Latin may also be consulted. Compare the teaching set forth in the "Catechism of the Council of Trent," p. 161.—T.↩
2. Burnet, "Exposition of the Thirty-Nine Articles," pp. 429–437.↩
3. Aquinas held that the body of Christ is present not *localiter*, or *per modum dimensionum*, but *per modum substantiae*. "So the real body of Christ in the eucharist," says Sheldon (*History of Christian Doctrine*, I. 397), "turns out to be the most unreal and ghostly thing of which human ingenuity ever attempted to draw the outlines."—T.↩
4. For a full discussion of the import of this last sentence, see Vol. I., pp. 302–304.—T.↩

Part VII.

Article XIX.
Of Both Kinds.

451

The cup of the Lord is not to he denied to the lay people; for both the parts of the Lord's-supper, by Christ's ordinance and commandment, ought to be administered to all Christians alike.

Introduction.

This is the same as the Anglican Article, except that "supper" is substituted for "sacrament," and "Christians" for "Christian men."

The vagueness of the title can be accounted for by the connection of this article with the preceding, and by the familiarity of the phrase (in Latin, *De Utraque Specie*) in those days of controversy with the Papists.

Chapter I.
The Romish Doctrine as Defined by the Councils.

§ 1. Introductory.

452
No dogma or practice of the Romish Church is more palpably opposed to the teaching of the Scripture and the practice of the Church for more than a thousand years, and none has been more resolutely opposed, than the withholding of the cup from the laity. It is, indeed, condemned by the very synodal decrees by which it is established.

§ 2. The Council of Constance.

Thus the Council of Constance, which first decreed "Half Communion" (A.D. 1414), says:

Whereas, in several parts of the world, some have rashly presumed to assert that all Christians ought to receive the holy sacrament of the eucharist under both species of the bread and wine, and that also after supper, or not fasting, contrary to the laudable custom of the Church, justly approved of, which they damnably endeavor to reprobate as sacrilegious: hence it is that this holy General Council of Constance, assembled by the Holy Ghost to provide for the salvation of the faithful against this error, declares, decrees, and defines, that although Christ did after supper institute this holy sacrament, and administered it to his disciples in both kinds of bread and wine, yet this notwithstanding, the laudable authoritv of the sacred canons, and the approved custom of the Church, hath fixed and doth fix, that this sacrament ought not to be consecrated after supper nor received by the faithful except fasting. And as this custom, for the purpose of avoiding certain dangers and scandals, has been rationally introduced, and that although this sacrament was received by the faithful under both kinds in the primitive Church, it was afterward received by the faithful under both kinds by the officiating priests, and by the people under the species of bread only, it being believed most certainly, and nothing doubted, that the entire body and blood of Christ are really contained as well under the species of bread as of wine; this, therefore being approved, it is now made a law. Likewise this holy synod decrees and declares, as to

this matter, to the reverend fathers in Christ, patriarchs, lords, etc., that they must effectually punish all such as shall transgress this decree, or shall exhort to communicate the people in both kinds.

§ 3. The Council of Trent.

So the Council of Trent:

Although Christ the Lord did in the last supper institute this venerable sacrament

453

of the eucharist in the species of bread and wine, and thus delivered it to the apostles, yet it does not thence follow that all the faithful in Christ are bound by divine statute to receive both kinds. Moreover the Council declares, that though our Redeemer, as has been before said, did, in the last Supper, institute this sacrament in two kinds, and thus delivered it to the apostles, it must, nevertheless, be granted that the true sacrament and Christ, whole and entire, is received in either kind by itself.

The Council then proceeds to curse all who may gainsay these decrees.

It seems impossible to produce a case in which the word of God is more obviously made of none effect by the traditions of men than this. It is explicitly stated that the apostles and primitive Christians communicated in both kinds; yet the Church orders otherwise.

We shall see [in the succeeding chapter] by what argument Romanists defend this sacrilegious invasion of Christ's authority and this mutilation of his ordinance.

Chapter II.
The Romish Arguments Stated and Refuted.

§ 1. Romish Claim Concerning Christ's Institution.

454

Romanists say that though Christ administered to the apostles in both kinds, yet they were priests, and so this example is not to the point. But why withhold the cup only, and not the bread as well, as both were given to the apostles? And why withhold the cup from non-officiating priests, when Christ gave it to those who were not officiating? They say, indeed, that the apostles were not priests till Christ said *Hoc facite* and gave them the bread. By these words he made them priests, and then gave them the cup. But why give it to them if they were priests, seeing they were not officiating? But then the words, "Do this in remembrance of me," mean, "Eat and drink bread and wine in remembrance of me:" receive as communicants, not administer as priests, as a child can see. Indeed, the apostles never were priests, and they are never so styled in the New Testament. There are no official priests in the Christian Church; bishops and presbyters are never called priests. So much for that contemptible quibble.

§ 2. Romish Claim of Christ's Administration at Emmaus.

Romanists say Christ administered the sacrament in one kind to the disciples at Emmaus after his resurrection; for Luke says, he took bread, and blessed it, and brake and gave to them. (Luke xxiv. 30.) But this was an ordinary meal. He did as he had been accustomed to do, and as the heads of families among the Jews were accustomed to do, namely, bless or give thanks over the food, and break and distribute it. (*Cf.* Matt. xiv. 19; xv. 36.)

§ 3. Romish Claim Based on Passages in the Acts.

But Romanists say the communing in the Acts of the Apostles is spoken of as "the breaking of bread." (Acts ii.; xx.) What then? Did the apostles celebrate the eucharist without wine? Do Romanists allow this? Does not everybody know that breaking bread is a familiar way of speaking of a repast, where

there is abundance of other provisions besides bread, and no lack of wine?

§ 4. Romish Use of i Cor. xi. 27 and John vi. 51.

The Romanists absurdly adduce 1 Cor. xi. 27 in support of their error: "Whosoever shall eat this bread *or* drink this cup of the Lord unworthily shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord." Admitting that ἢ, "or," is the true reading, what does it prove? Why simply this, that the profane use of either the bread or the wine in this ordinance is a grievous sin. Some of the Corinthians to whom the apostle was writing were guilty of this very sin: they ate to gluttony, they drank to drunkenness. They certainly used "both kinds." Alford well remarks:

> The Romanists absurdly enough defend by this ἢ their practice of communicating only in one kind. Translated into common language, and applied to the ordinary sustenance of the body, their reasoning stands thus: "Whoever eats to excess, *or* drinks to excess, is guilty of sin; therefore eating, without drinking, will sustain life."

In five other places in this and the preceding chapter the apostle speaks of eating *and* drinking, and it is very clear the Corinthians did both. We are ashamed to reply to such sophistry; it is evident that sensible Romanists are ashamed of it themselves.

So of the reference to John vi. 51, "If any man eat of this bread he shall live forever," in which there is no reference to the eucharist. But if there were, it would be all the worse for their cause, for the Saviour immediately adds, when the Jews said, "How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" "Verily, verily, I say unto you. Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you." If this refers to the sacrament, every lay Romanist is damned, for not one ever drinks the blood.

But the Schoolmen have foisted in the doctrine of "Concomitance" to meet the case. Thomas Aquinas is said to have been the inventor of this term—in *Summa*, P. iii., Qu. 76, Art. 1.: *"Sciendum, quod aliquid Christi est in hoc sacramento duplicitu: uno modo quasi ex vi sacramenti, alio modo ex naturali concomitantia."* By this barbarous term he meant to convey the idea that as the flesh and blood are mingled in the natural body, so that

if you have the former you have also the latter, so in the sacrament there is the accompanying of the body of Christ by the blood, and of the blood by the body.

This partakes of the absurdity of the dogma of transubstantiation which occasioned it. In the living body the blood is transfused through every part; but in the bread there is no wine, and in the wine there is no bread. There may be said to be a kind of concomitancy in the elements when the bread is dipped into the wine and so administered. But this practice, though sometimes allowed by popes and councils, and still obtaining in the Oriental Communions, has been disallowed by other popes and councils (demonstrating their infallibility!) and is not tolerated at present in the Western Church. The bread in the eucharist is to be broken and the wine is to be poured out, to represent not the living body of Christ, but his body broken and his blood shed upon the cross. Hence the elements are administered separately, and all notion of concomitance is absolutely excluded. How absurd it is to say that a grain of flesh or a drop of blood contains the whole body with the blood of a man! One would think that such a preposterous assertion could be made nowhere except in the hospital for the insane. No sane man can believe it. If the doctrine of concomitance were true, one would think the wine should be given rather than the bread, because, though our Lord doubtless intended all his disciples to receive both kinds, yet in giving the bread he simply said, "Take, eat, this is my body, which is given for you; this do in remembrance of me;" whereas when he gave the cup he was more precise and emphatic, saying, "Drink ye all of it, for this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." And Mark says explicitly: "And they all drank of it." What a pity that the

angelical doctor, Thomas Aquinas, had not been present to supply the place of Judas the traitor! He could have suggested the more excellent way of dispensing with the cup on the ground of concomitance. But neither Christ nor the apostles seem to have thought of that; nor did any of the Fathers; nor was it dreamed of till the thirteenth century.

There is no end to the absurdities it involves. If after the priest pronounces the "quinque verbal charm," *Hoc enim est corpus meum*, the bread is changed into the body, blood, soul, and divinity of Christ, why does he proceed to consecrate the wine?

457

Is he going to transubstantiate that into the same body, blood, soul, and divinity? or is he going to make another Christ, another God? And if, by the law of concomitance, when he ate the bread he also drank the blood, or at least swallowed it, why does he afterward drink the wine? Is this a second eucharist? another communion? If he were not to take the bread, but only the wine, and but a single drop of it, according to the law of concomitance he would be taking the whole Christ, flesh, blood, body, soul, and divinity. Whoever doubts this is cursed by the infallible Council of Trent.

§ 6. Puerile Objections to the Use of Wine.

But Romanists urge, in defense of withholding the cup from the laity, that sometimes it is difficult to get wine, and some stomachs will not take it; that there is danger of spilling it; that the whiskers and beard may get into it; and other puerilities of the kind—which deserve no serious answer.

Pope Innocent VIII. allowed the Norwegians to celebrate without wine, because they could not get it without difficulty; but suppose they could not have gotten wheat bread without difficulty, would he have allowed them to celebrate with wine alone? It is said that Oberlin used water on the Alps because he could not get wine. It would have been better to forego the ordinance altogether, as God's grace is not confined to sacraments. Where we cannot use the means of grace he dispenses the grace without the means.

§ 7. Romish Attempts to Prove Apostolic Half-communion.

Although the Councils of Constance and Trent admit that the Apostolic and Primitive Church communed in both kinds, yet Eckius, Harding, Bellarmin, and some other Romanists, assert that this was not the universal custom. But Bona, one of their greatest authorities, conclusively shows that it was universal. He says, however, that "out of the time of sacrifice, and out of the Church, it was customary always and everywhere to communicate in one kind." But Bingham ("Antiquities" xv. v. 1, 2) shows that he was mistaken in this by the examples furnished by Gregory Nazianzen, Ambrose, Justin Martyr, Chrysostom, and others. Both the bread and wine were sent to the communicants, and sometimes reserved by them, when they could not attend the public celebration.

458

In the Gothic version of Ulphilas, in the fourth century, there is this remarkable addition in 1 Cor. x. 17: "We are all partakers of that one bread *and that one cup.*" The partaking of the cup must have been common among the Goths at that time. It is further worthy of remark that D and F, the Sixtine Vulgate, and some other Latin versions, have this reading.

§ 8. The Hussite Wars.

It is scarcely necessary to revert to the contentions and bloodshed resulting from the withholding of the cup from the laity.

Hagenbach says:

> In the fifteenth century the cup was again violently reclaimed in Bohemia. It was not at first Huss, but his colleague, Jacobellus of Misa, who demanded, in the absence of the former, that the laity should be re-admitted to the participation of the Lord's-supper, *sub utraque forma.* Huss afterward approved of what he had done. It was well known that this demand, which was in opposition to the Synod of Constance, gave rise to the wars of the Hussites. The consequence was that the Council of Basle confirmed the doctrine of the Church, according to which it is sufficient to partake of the Lord's-supper *sub una forma*; but it permitted exceptions when the Church deemed it desirable.

§ 9. Is the Romish Sect a Church?

There is one embarrassing question arising out of this half-communion of the Papists. Nearly all our authorities (with whom we agree) recognize the Romish sect as a branch, though a corrupt branch, of the catholic Church. But one of the notes of the Church is this, that in it "the sacraments are duly administered, according to Christ's ordinance, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same." Now we have seen that the drinking of the wine is just as necessary as the eating of the bread; the latter is no more a part of the sacrament than the former. "Drink ye all of it," said Christ, "and they all drank of it." Some of the popes declared it a grand sacrilege to do the one without the other. Pope Gelasius complains that some received the bread but abstained from the cup. These he condemns as guilty of superstition, and orders that they should either receive in both or else be excluded from both; because, he says, one and the same mystery cannot be divided without great sacrilege. Leo the Great (440–461) says:

> They receive the body of Christ with an unworthy month, but refuse to drink the blood of our redemption. Such men's sacrilegious dissimulation being discovered, let them be marked, and by the authority of the priesthood cast out of the society of the faithful.

459

Bingham pertinently remarks:

> It is vain to say here, as Bona does, that these decrees were only made against the Manichees, who believed wine to be the gall of the prince of darkness, and the creature of the devil, and therefore refused to drink it; for their reasons are general against all superstition whatsoever, and in their opinion the sacrament may not be divided without grand sacrilege, and thwarting the rule of the first institution—which Bona might have learned from another decree related in their canon law, under the name of Pope Julius, who says, "The giving of the bread and the cup, each distinct by themselves, is a divine order and apostolical institution, and that it is as much against the law of Christ to give them jointly by dipping the one into the other, as it is to offer milk instead of wine, or the juice of the grape immediately pressed out of the cluster; all which are equally contrary to the evangelical and apostolical doctrine, as well as the custom of the Church, as may be proved from the Fountain of truth, by whom the mysteries of the sacraments were ordained."

In view of these facts and authorities, Dr. Adam Clarke seems warranted in saying: "The sacrament of the Lord's-supper is not celebrated in the Church of Rome." By a fair logic, therefore, it

would seem that the Romish Communion is not merely a corrupt Church, but no real Church at all. But inasmuch as Romanists never celebrate the eucharist without wine, of which the laity would partake if allowed to do so, by a great stretch of charity Protestants generally recognize them as still members of the visible Church, though sadly corrupt in doctrine and practice, and the rather as they profess to receive the Holy Scriptures and the Three Creeds, however grossly they misinterpret them and sacrilegiously eke them out with their own traditions.

Part VIII.

Article XX.
Of the One Oblation of Christ, Finished Upon the Cross.

460

The offering of Christ, once made, is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction, for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin but that alone. Wherefore the sacrifice of masses, in which it is commonly said that the priest doth offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, is a blasphemous fable and dangerous deceit.

Introduction.

This article is the same as Article XXXI. of the Anglican Confession, except a few verbal changes in the final sentence, which reads thus in the English Book: "Wherefore the sacrifices of masses, in the which it was commonly said, that the priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain and guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits."

The doctrine contained in the first sentence of this article, as opposed to Socinian, Calvinistic, and other errors, has been fully discussed under the Second Article.[1] It is here adduced to oppose the Romish error concerning the sacrifice of the mass.

1. See "The Atonement," Vol. I., pp. 215–298.—T.↩

Chapter I.
The Romish Doctrine of the Mass.

§ 1. Canons of the Council of Trent.

461
The Romish doctrine of the sacrifice of the mass is set forth by the Council of Trent (Ses. xxii., *De Sacrificio Missae*):

Canon 1. If any one shall say that a true and proper sacrifice is not offered to God in the mass, or that what is to be offered is nothing else than giving Christ to us to eat: let him be accursed.

Canon 2. If any one shall say, that by these words, "Do this for a commemoration of me," Christ did not appoint his apostles priests, or did not ordain that they and other priests should offer his body and blood: let him be accursed.

Canon 3. If any one shall say, that the mass is only a service of praise and thanksgiving, or a bare commemoration of the sacrifice made on the cross, and not a propitiatory offering; or that it only benefits him who receives it, and ought not to be offered for the living and the dead, for sins, punishments, satisfactions, and other necessities: let him be accursed.[1]

It will be seen that the article is leveled directly against the doctrine contained in these Canons. In no other case does the bad faith of the Romanizers in the Church of England show itself more fully than in this. The article declares "the sacrifice of masses a blasphemous fable and dangerous deceit;" and the Tridentine Canons curse all who so affirm.

§ 2. The Roman Catechism.

By a strange fatuity the Roman Catechism appeals to the Scriptures in support of this monstrous error. It says:

The doctrine of the Catholic Church, with regard to this sacrifice, she received from our Lord when at his last supper, committing to his apostles the sacred mysteries, he commanded them and their successors in the ministry, to immolate and offer in sacrifice his precious body and blood.

Now it might be a sufficient answer to say, Christ did no such

thing. The record shows that he did not, as we have already seen. He never called this sacrament a sacrifice; it is never so styled in the Scripture. He did not call it the mass; this barbarous term is never used in Scripture, nor by the Apostolic Fathers.[2]

462

Christ did not make his apostles priests; he never called them priests; they never called themselves priests, in any sense in which all Christians are not priests. He never told them "to immolate and offer in sacrifice his precious body and blood," and they never did so horrible a thing.

§ 3. Romish Proof from i Cor. x. 21 Considered.

But the Cathechism refers us to 1 Cor. x. 21: "Of this the words of the apostle to the Corinthians also afford sufficient evidence: 'You cannot,' says he, drink the chalice of the Lord, and the chalice of devils; you cannot be partakers of the table of the Lord, and of the table of devils." If they had belonged to "the holy Roman Church," they could not have drunk "the chalice of the Lord," for the priests would not have given it to them. "As thus," continues the Cathechism, "by the 'table of devils' we understand the altar upon which sacrifice was offered to them, so by 'the table of the Lord,' to bring the words of the apostle to an apposite conclusion, should be understood the altar on which sacrifice was offered to the Lord."

But by the table of devils we do not understand "the altar upon which sacrifice was offered to them." The heathen did not use the altar as a table at which they ate of the sacrifice. Josephus, in his discourse against Apion, Book II., says: "The heathen offer hecatombs to their gods, and use their temples for their banqueting houses." Hence Paul says: "If any man see thee which hast knowledge sit at meat [κατακείμενον, reclining at table] in the idol's temple, shall not the conscience of him which is weak be emboldened to eat those things which are offered to idols?" (1 Cor. viii. 10.) The custom of feasting on the sacrifices in the temples was of high antiquity. The priests before they poured the wine upon the sacrifice tasted it themselves; they then carried it to the offerers and to those who came with them, that they might also taste it. By thus eating and drinking they showed their interest in the sacrifice, and

claimed the benefit supposed to be derived from it. (*Cf.* Virgil, *Aeneid*, viii. 273; Num. xxii. 40; xxv. 2; 1 Cor. x. 7.) Meat thus offered to idols was sometimes eaten by the heathen in their own houses, as Paul says, 1 Cor. x. 25–28.

Paul says that the Israelites which eat of the sacrifices are partakers of the altar (1 Cor. x. 18); but everybody knows they

did not eat at the altar, as at a table. It was taken from the altar, and eaten elsewhere, on a table or otherwise; and by thus feasting on the sacrifice they proclaimed their interest in it, and their communion with him to whom it was offered. So the sacrifice of Christ was offered upon the altar of his cross; and we feast upon that sacrifice by faith when we commemorate his death in the Lord's-supper. It is as impossible to speak of one's feasting on an altar as it is to speak of Christ's being sacrificed on a table.

When Paul says, "We have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle" (Heb. xiii. 10), he is to be understood as MacKnight interprets:

> Here, by a usual metonomy, the altar is put for the sacrifice, as is plain from the apostle's adding, "of which they have no right to eat." The sacrificing belonging to those who believe is the sacrifice of himself which Christ offered to God in heaven for the sin of the world; and the eating of that sacrifice doth not mean the corporal eating thereof, but the partaking of the pardon which Christ hath procured for sinners by that sacrifice.

The word θυσιαστήριον, "altar," occurs twenty-three times in the New Testament, and never once means the Lord's table.[3] Ignatius, if the passage (Ad Philadelph. Sec. 4) be genuine, says we have one altar (*thusiasterion*), which some think refers to the Lord's table, because he is speaking of the eucharist, in which all the members of the Church unite. But his meaning is uncertain, and so is the genuineness of the passage. In after times the Fathers talk glibly enough about the altar, the unbloody sacrifice, the officiating priest, and the like, thus preparing the way for the Romish heresy. Why did not the apostles talk in that style? Simply because they did not consider the Lord's-supper a sacrifice, the Lord's table an altar, or the Lord's minister a priest.

§ 4. Alleged Old Testament Proofs.

But the Catechism proceeds:

Should we look for figures and prophecies of this sacrifice in the Old Testament, we find in the first place that its institution was clearly foretold by Malachy in these words: “From the rising of the sun, even to the going down thereof, my name is great among the Gentiles, and in every place there is sacrifice, and there is offered to my name a clean oblation; for my name is great among the Gentiles, saith the Lord of hosts.”

464

If there were any reference to the eucharist in this passage, the incense and the pure offering would simply mean the prayers and thanksgivings accompanying the celebration; these being common figurative expressions in the Scripture denoting such devotions. (Ps. li. 16, 17; Heb. xiii. 15, 16; Ps. cxli. 2; Rev. viii. 3, 4.) A note in the Geneva Bible, on Mal. i. 11, gives the obvious meaning:

God showeth that their ingratitude and neglect of his true service shall be the cause of the calling of the Gentiles; and here the prophet that was under the law, framed his words to the capacity of the people, and by the altar and sacrifice he meaneth the spiritual service of God which should be under the gospel, when an end should be made to all their legal ceremonies, by Christ’s only sacrifice.

The prophet never dreamed of the Lord’s-supper; he never thought of a literal sacrifice and literal incense any more than Isaiah, when describing the latter-day glory of the Church, thought there would be, in the literal sense, priests and Levites, new moon solemnities, wolves and lambs feeding together, and lions eating straw like bullocks. (Isa. lxv.; lxvi.) Did our Lord have incense when he instituted the eucharist? Is there any reference to its use in the apostolic Church? Cardinal Bona and other Romanists derived its use from the apostles; but Bingham exposes their error, and shows that “there are no footsteps of these things in the first three ages of the Church.” (“Antiquities,” Book viii. Chap, vi.)

§ 5. The Sacrifice of Melchizedek.

The Catechism continues:

This saving victim was also foretold, as well before as after the promulgation of the Mosaic law, by a variety of sacrifices; for this alone, as the perfection and completion of all, comprises all the advantages which were typified by the other sacrifices. In none of the sacrifices of the old

law, however, do we discover a more lively image of the eucharistic sacrifice than in that of Melchisedech. Our Lord himself, at his last supper, offered to his Eternal Father his precious body and blood under the appearances of bread and wine, at the same time declaring himself "a priest forever after the order of Melchisedech."

It is difficult to conceive of any thing more sophistical than this passage. When it is said, "This saving victim was foretold by a variety of sacrifices," the sophism is too patent. Everybody knows that the sacrifice of Christ was typified by patriarchal and Jewish sacrifices; but what has that to do with the matter? A large part of the Epistle to the Hebrews—the Leviticus of the New Testament—is

taken up with this subject; but where in that Epistle does the apostle make the slightest allusion to the eucharist? Indeed, he never alludes to it in all his Epistles, except in 1 Cor. x.; xi. Does Moses intimate that the bread and wine which Melchizedek gave to Abram typified the body and blood of Christ in the eucharist? Does he intimate that the bread and wine were offered in sacrifice to God? Does Paul, in his allusion to this subject? Here is the simple record: "And Melchizedek, king of Salem, brought forth bread and wine; and he was the priest of the most high God. And he blessed him, and said, Blessed be Abram of the most high God, possessor of heaven and earth: and blessed be the most high God, which hath delivered thine enemies into thy hand. And he gave him tithes of all." (Gen. xiv. 18–20.) A child can see that Melchizedek gave Abram and his company the bread and wine for their refreshment after their pursuit and slaughter of the marauders. Barzillai and others acted in a similar manner toward David and the people that were with him. (2 Sam. xvii. 27–29.) There is no other allusion to this circumstance except in Paul's Epistle to the Hebrews; and there he pays not one word of the bread and wine—an unaccountable omission if it involved so great a mystery. He enlarges upon the tithes paid Melchizedek by Abram, and used it as an argument to prove "how great this man was" whose priesthood was, in a sense, higher than that of Aaron's and typical of the priesthood of our Lord. It is remarkable, too, that Paul is the only writer of the New Testament who calls our Lord a priest. And there is no other place in the whole Bible in which he is so styled (unless Zach. vi. 13 be an exception) save Ps. cx. 4, "Thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchizedek," a passage which Paul cites twice in direct form in

this chapter, and twice indirectly in the two preceding chapters. The Catechism says: “At his last supper he offered to his Eternal Father his precious body and blood under the appearances of bread and wine.” He did no such thing. He offered himself without spot to God upon the cross; but he offered nothing but prayers and thanksgivings to God at the sacramental table; the bread and wine he offered exclusively to his disciples. He did not “at the same time declare himself ‘a priest forever after the order of Melchizedek.’” He never said that on any recorded occasion. He showed himself as the antitype of Melchizedek, and

left it to the great apostle, under inspiration, thus to apply the narrative of Moses and the prediction of the psalmist.

§ 6. Proofs from Tradition.

The Catechism of course claims apostolic tradition for the sacrifice of the mass; and Romanists generally claim the authority of the Fathers for it. Now there is no apostolic tradition for the mass, as we have seen; and the testimony of the Fathers will afford them no support.

Athenagoras (A.D. 150) is said to be the first who used that famous expression, “the unbloody sacrifice.” He says: “Of what service to me are whole burnt offerings, of which God has no need? although it be right to offer an unbloody sacrifice, and to bring the reasonable service.” The latter clause would seem to prove that he had no reference to the eucharist. He contrasts the sacrifice of praise, etc.—an unbloody sacrifice—with the bloody sacrifices of the law. He may indeed have alluded to the eucharist as a meat or bread offering, as contrasted with bloody sacrifices; the bread and wine are sometimes in the writings of the Fathers spoken of in this way. But this proves nothing.

The Papists contradict and stultify themselves when they call the eucharist the unbloody sacrifice, as contrasted with the bloody sacrifice on the cross, for they tell us they are one and the same. They say that real blood as well as real flesh is offered in the eucharist—the bread being no longer bread, the wine being no longer wine, both being transubstantiated into the real body and the real blood of Christ. And yet, forsooth, this is an unbloody

sacrifice.

The Liturgy falsely ascribed to St. James, written at a much later date, calls it the “tremendous and unbloody sacrifice.” Chrysostom calls it “the fearful and tremendous sacrifice.” Cyril of Jerusalem speaks of the “spiritual sacrifice and the bloodless service over that sacrifice of propitiation.” But then Chrysostom explains himself thus: “There is but one sacrifice; we do not offer another sacrifice, but continually the same; or rather we make a memorial (ἀνάμνησιν) of the sacrifice.” Augustin also says: “Christians celebrate the memorial of the same fully finished sacrifice by sacred oblation and participation of Christ’s body and blood.” Like many other of this Father’s utterances, this is ambiguous; yet one thing seems clear, that he considered the eucharist nothing more than a commemorative sacrifice.

---

1. For the original Latin text of these Canons and a slightly variant English translation, see Schaff, *Creeds of Christendom*, Vol. II., pp. 184, 185.—T.↩
2. For a full history of the employment of the term see Bingham, *Antiquities*, Book XIII., Chap. i.↩
3. Thayer, in his *New Testament Lexicon*, under this word gives as a secondary meaning “the cross on which Christ suffered an expiatory death,” and explains “to eat of this altar” as meaning “to appropriate to one’s self the fruits of Christ’s expiatory death,” citing Heb. xiii. 10.—T.↩

Chapter II.
The Protestant Position.

§ 1. The Doctrine as Argued in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

467

The Fathers would hardly contradict the great apostle who, in his Epistle to the Hebrews, labors through several chapters to prove that there can be no repetition of the Saviour's propitiatory sacrifice. His language needs no comment: "For such a High-priest became us, . . . who needeth not daily, as those high-priests to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the people's; for this he did once, when he offered up himself." (Heb. vii. 26, 27.) "Nor yet that he should offer himself often, as the high-priest entereth into the holy place every year with blood of others; for then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world: but now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment: so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation. For the law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never with those sacrifices which they offered year by year continually, make the comers thereunto perfect. For then would they not have ceased to be offered? because that the worshipers once purged should have had no more conscience of sins." (Heb. ix. 25–x. 2.) "And every priest standeth daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins; but this man after he had offered one sacrifice for sins forever, sat down on the right hand of God, from henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool. For by one offering he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified." (Heb. x. 11–14.)

In view of these plain passages of the inspired writings, well might our article say "the sacrifice by masses, in which it is commonly said that the priest doth offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, is a blasphemous fable and dangerous deceit."

§ 2. The Lord's-supper Benefits Only Those Present.

468

The Lord's-supper benefits none but those who are engaged in its celebration. How can absent persons, particularly dead persons, be benefited by such a service? The living, indeed, may be benefited by our prayers offered at the Lord's table; but the same prayers offered elsewhere would have the same effect.

The truth is, the mass, like purgatory, aggrandizes and enriches the priesthood, and that is the reason that so much stress is laid upon it. Why should men care about partaking of the bread and wine, or either of the elements, if the priest can perform mass for them without their presence? The Council of Trent allows of solitary masses, and issues this canon: "If any one shall say that those masses in which the priest only communicates sacramentally are unlawful, and therefore ought to be abolished: let him be accursed."

If a man can live in sin and die in sin, and go to purgatory, and then be delivered out of it and made meet for heaven by masses said for him by the priest, will he not be emboldened to continue in sin all the days of his life? And is not this "a dangerous deceit?" And where are men, and especially women, so lost to the sentiments of humanity that they will not pay all that a mercenary priesthood might demand for masses to deliver their friends from the horrible fire of purgatory? Purgatorian societies are formed, the members of which pay a certain sum at stated times to procure masses to be said for the relief of the souls in purgatory. This is done in the enlightened nineteenth century, and not only in papist countries, but in our own land. And what is this but "a blasphemous fable and dangerous deceit?" But we have discussed this subject under the Fourteenth Article, "Of Purgatory." [See Vol. II, pp. 246–252.]

§ 3. Conclusion.

We have only to add that, properly speaking, the Lord's-supper is no sacrifice. In the Scripture all acts of religious worship, are indeed figuratively styled sacrifices, as we have seen. *Cf.* Ps. li. 17;

cxli. 2; Hos. xiv. 2; Heb. xiii. 15. So acts of charity and beneficence are styled sacrifices, because we part with a portion of our substance for the aid of the needy. "To do good and to communicate, forget not; for with such sacrifices God is well pleased." (Heb. xiii. 16; *cf.* Phil. iv. 18.) So the consecration

of ourselves to the service of God is called "a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is our reasonable service." (Rom. xii. 1.) But there is no other sacrifice in the Lord's-supper. It is called a eucharist, which means a thanksgiving service, because in it we render thanks unto God for the unspeakable gift of his Son, and offer prayers to him for the realization of all the benefits of his passion. It has been customary, too, at this service to contribute of our substance to the poorer members of Christ's body, though this is no essential part of the sacrament. In it we do offer the sacrifice of ourselves to God, presenting the offering as it were upon the great meritorious atoning sacrifice of Christ, so strikingly set forth in symbol in this ordinance. This is beautifully expressed in the Post-communion Service: "O Lord and Heavenly Father, we thy humble servants desire thy fatherly goodness mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving," etc.

Some of the ancients spoke of the bread and wine as an oblation or sacrifice, because these elements are set apart for a religious use and are consumed in an act of divine service. Some of the moderns also speak in this style. There is no warrant for it in Scripture, but if properly understood and duly guarded, no harm perhaps will come from it. The custom, however, is more honored in the breach than in the observance.

Jerome, writing to Vigilantius, says: "The sacrifices ought not to be offered to Christ on every Lord's-day, lest we should keep too frequently the Easter of our Lord's resurrection, and begin to have not one Easter in the year, but many." We have nothing to do with Jerome's logic, which, as is not uncommon with him, is rather limping; but the fact which he states is suggestive; as the learned author of "The Primitive Doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, as Exhibited in Early Liturgies," expresses it:

> That it would seem that in Jerome's time the sacrifices were offered every Lord's-day, not every day. And that the sacrifices were regarded as offered to Christ. Of course, if the sacrifices were offered to Christ, the sacrifices could not consist of his body and his blood.

The Fathers sometimes speak of the eucharist as a commemorative sacrifice. We offer the body and blood of Christ, symbolized by the bread and wine, and realized by faith, to the eternal Father as the satisfaction for our sins. We commemorate his sacrifice on the cross. But this can hardly warrant the use of

so ambiguous an expression. The commemoration or representation of a sacrifice is not properly a sacrifice; it cannot be that which it represents. The metaphor is confused and misleading, and without labored explanation and constant guarding will mislead the common mind.

The Privy Council, indeed, has lately decided in the case of Sheppard, *v.* Barnett, that a belief in a commemorative sacrifice in the eucharist, does not contravene the article, as Bishop Bull and other great authorities of the Church of England, use this language. Bishop Bull says: "In the holy eucharist we set before God the bread and wine 'as figures, or images, of the precious blood of Christ shed for us, and of his precious body.' They are the very words of the Clementine Liturgy." That is good Protestant, scriptural doctrine. But why call it a commemorative *sacrifice*? We should not give the slightest handle to Romanists and Ritualists, who say:

> That which we see on the altar after consecration is not a picture of Christ's body now in heaven, but the consecrated sacrament is the same body which was crucified, and that the Victim itself which has been slain constitutes the sacrifice in the eucharist.

Part IX.

Article XXI.
Of the Marriage of Ministers.

471

The ministers of Christ are not commanded by God's law either to vow the estate of single life, or to abstain from marriage; therefore it is lawful for them, as for all other Christians, to marry at their own discretion, as they shall judge the same to serve best to godliness.

Introduction.

This corresponds to Article XXXII. of the Anglican Confession, with some important changes.

The Reformers were not very happy in the titles which they prefixed to the articles; they were particularly unhappy in this case: "Of the Marriage of Priests;" in the Latin, *De Conjugio Sacerdotum*. Yet the article begins, *Episcopis, presbyteris, et diaconis* in the Latin, "Bishops, priests and deacons" in the English: as if all these were comprehended under the title "Priests." Then there is an inconsistency in putting *Sacerdotum* in the title, and *presbyteris* in the article, as if *sacerdos* and *presbyter* were the same. *Sacerdos* means priest—a sacrificing priest—and is no rendering of the Greek *presbuteros*, which means presbyter or elder, as it is always rendered in our version, except in one case in the plural, "eldest," John viii. 9, and "old men," Acts ii. 17. But ἱερεύς is always rendered "priest," never "elder." Who would think of calling Aaron *the high elder*? or of calling the Levitical priests *elders*? The word *priest*, as an abridgment of presbyter, as Milton says ("New presbyter is but 'old priest' writ large"), might do, if priest had not been appropriated as the rendering of *hiereus*, which means *sacerdos*, a sacrificing priest. Romanizers have taken advantage of this ambiguity to give countenance to their sacerdotal pretensions. Hooker did well to prefer presbyter to priest, though he was not always consistent in this matter.

472

Mr. Wesley did well to change the title to “The Marriage of Ministers,” and to begin the article with “The ministers of Christ.” As “bishops” in the Anglican Article designates a class or order of ministers superior to “priests,” and as in the New Testament bishops and presbyters are the same, Mr. Wesley preferred to call those who were placed over presbyters “Superintendents;” but as this word means the same as “bishop” there is no objection to such an appropriation of the title, and so it was used in the post-apostolic age. But as no distinction is called for in the article, it is well to say simply “ministers of Christ;” that comprehends all grades in the ministry.

Instead of “Christian men” we have “Christians,” which is to be preferred; as is “best” instead of “better” in the last clause.

The inferential part of this article beginning with “therefore” was not in the article as published in King Edward’s time.

This is the last of the anti-Romanist articles; and it is one which at the time excited great interest.

Chapter I.
The Romish Doctrine Stated and Refuted.

§ 1. The Tridentine Statement.

473

It is scarcely necessary to say that the article is leveled against the enforced celibacy of the Romish clergy. The Council of Trent, Canon 9, Ses. xxiv., says:

> Whoever shall affirm that persons in holy orders, who have made a solemn profession of chastity, may contract marriage, and that the contract is valid notwithstanding any ecclesiastical law or vow; and that to maintain the contrary is nothing less than to condemn marriage; and that all persons may marry who feel that though they should make a vow of chastity they have not the gift thereof: let him be accursed. For God does not deny his gifts to those who ask aright, neither does he suffer us to be tempted above that we are able.

The article has nothing to do with the vow of celibacy except as it refers to ministers. But we may in passing denounce the Tridentine sophism insinuated in the contrast between marriage and chastity. Everybody knows that the Scriptures never oppose the one to the other. Those who are true to their marriage vows are as chaste as those who live continually in a state of celibacy. It ill becomes those to say otherwise who make marriage one of the seven sacraments. The superior sanctity supposed to reside in the clerical character and profession does not therefore require that ministers should be celibates; indeed, it rather requires that they should enter “the holy estate of matrimony.” For marriage “is an honorable estate instituted of God in the time of man’s innocency, signifying unto us the mystical union that is between Christ and his Church; which holy estate Christ adorned and beautified with his presence and first miracle that he wrought in Cana of Galilee, and is so commended of St. Paul to be honorable among all men.” Christ and the apostles speak in the highest terms of matrimony, and exhort to chastity in this holy estate. (Matt. xix. 3–12; 1 Cor. vii.; Eph. v. 22–33; 1 Thess. iv. 3–8; 1 Tim. ii. 15; iv. 3; v. 14; Titus ii. 4, 5; Heb. xiii. 4; 1 Pet. iii. 1–7.)

How gloriously does our great poet descant on this inspiring
474
theme! Speaking of our first parents and their connubial love, he says (Book iv. 743–765):

> Whatever hypocrites austerely talk
> Of purity and place and innocence,
> Defaming as impure what God declares
> Pure, and commands to some, leaves free to all.
> Our Maker bids increase; who bids abstain
> But our Destroyer, foe to God and Man?
> Hail wedded Love! mysterious law, true source
> Of human offspring, sole propriety
> In Paradise of all things common else.
> By thee adulterous Lust was driven from men
> Among the bestial herds to range; by thee,
> Founded in reason, loyal, just, and pure,
> Relations dear, and all the charities
> Of father, son, and brother, first were known.
> Far be it, that I should write thee sin or blame,
> Or think thee unbefitting holiest place.
> Perpetual fountain of domestic sweets,
> Whose bed is undefiled and chaste pronounced,
> Present or past, as saints and patriarchs used.
> Here Love his golden shafts employs, here lights
> His constant lamp, and waves his purple wings,
> Reigns here and revels.

§ 2. Inconsistency of the Church of Rome.

One is amazed at the inconsistency of the Church of Rome, which places matrimony among the sacraments, as it is so holy and divine an institution, and yet prohibits it to the clergy because of their great sanctity.

Were not the Jewish priests holy? or, at least, was not superior holiness required of them? And yet they were not only allowed to marry, but were commanded to do so, and the high-priest in particular was required to marry a virgin, or the widow of a priest, because it was important to keep the sacerdotal blood pure and

unmixed, as the priesthood descended from father to son. Romanists are fond of applying Jewish sacerdotal titles to their ministers, and claiming peculiar prerogatives for them after the Levitical order, and yet they will not allow them to marry.

§ 3. Marriage of Apostles and Evangelists.

They claim for their hierarchy a direct, uninterrupted succession from the apostles, and especially from Peter, whom they call the prince of the apostles and the first pope; yet this very same pope was a married man. Our Lord wrought a miracle to

cure Peter's wife's mother of a fever, and said not one word about his putting away his wife in order to become a pope. On the contrary Jesus enjoyed the hospitalities of his house at Capernaum, which in fact appears to have been his principal stopping-place. John seems to have had a home in Jerusalem, and it might be inferred that he had a family there. (John xix.) Eusebius (iii. 30) says:

> Clement gives a statement of those apostles that continued in the marriage state, on account of those who set marriage aside. "And will they," says he, "reject even the apostles? Peter and Philip, indeed, had children. Philip also gave his daughters in marriage to husbands, and Paul does not demur in a certain epistle to mention his own wife, whom he did not take about with him in order to expedite his ministry the better." Since, however, we have mentioned these we shall not regret to subjoin another history worthy of record, from the same author, continued in the seventh book of the same work, Stromateus. "They relate," says he, "that the blessed Peter, seeing his own wife led away to execution, was delighted, on account of her calling and return to her country, and that he cried to her in a consolatory and encouraging voice, addressing her by name, O thou, remember the Lord!" Such was the marriage of these blessed ones, and such was their perfect affection toward their dearest friends.

In the next chapter Eusebius quotes Polycrates, Bishop of Ephesus, as saying: "Philip, one of the twelve apostles, sleeps in Hierapolis, and his two aged virgin daughters; another of his daughters rests at Ephesus." But Eusebius seems to confound him with Philip the Evangelist, one of the seven, who had four virgin daughters who prophesied, as Luke says, in the Acts. But this is a

matter of little consequence, as the Romanists will not allow evangelists or deacons to marry any more than priests, bishops, or apostles. In his twentieth chapter of this third book Eusebius speaks of the grandchildren of Jude the Apostle, called the brother of our Lord. Epiphanius says Peter, Andrew, Matthew, and Bartholomew were all married men. Tertullian did not think Paul was married; others of the Fathers thought he was.

Now, we attach no importance to the statements of the Fathers, whatever Rome may say of their authority; but Romanists can consistently say nothing against them. One thing is certain, the Fathers never dreamed that the apostles or other ministers were debarred from matrimony.

§ 4. Paul's Doctrine.

Paul himself says: "Have we not power to lead about a sister,

476

a wife, as well as the other apostles and Cephas?" (1 Cor. ix. 5.)

The Romanists, indeed, render ἀδελφὴν γυναῖκα "a woman, a sister." The Romanists say this refers to the custom of rich women following the apostles to minister to them, as some followed our Lord. But, as Whitby says, "this interpretation seems to have had its rise from Tertullian when he was a Montanist." Theodoret mentions it without seeming to approve it. Clement of Alexandria confutes the enemies of matrimony from these very words, and says:

> They carried their wives about not as wives, but as sisters, to minister to those who were mistresses of families, that so the doctrine of the Lord might, without any reprehensive or evil suspicion, enter into the apartments of the women. This exposition seemeth (1) most agreeable to the words, which are not γυναῖκα ἀδελφήν, but ἀδελφὴν γυναῖκα, which cannot well be rendered a *sister-woman*, there being no sister which is not a woman. (2) It is most agreeable to the context, which plainly seems to speak not of such wealthy women which could nourish the apostles out of their abundance, but of such which were to be nourished with them by others. And (3) to the language of the Jews who called their wives *sisters*. Thus Tobit saith to his wife: "Take no care, my sister." (Tobit v. 20.) And lastly this seems best to consult the credit and esteem of the apostles, who could not without evil suspicion carry about with them single women, or the wives of other men. As for the women who are said to have followed Christ, they were none of his retinue, they attended not upon his person,

but upon his doctrine, and so they ministered no such ground of suspicion.

It is clear that Paul here affirms that “other apostles,” including those of note, “the brethren of the Lord and Cephas,” took their wives with them in their apostolic journeys, and that he had the right to do so, but declined it for special reasons. Whether or not he had a wife he does not say.

In his First Epistle to Timothy he says: “A bishop, then, must be blameless, the husband of one wife; one that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity.” So of the deacons: “Even so must their wives be grave. Let the deacons be the husbands of one wife, ruling their children, and their own houses well.” (1. Tim. iii.) Literally, “Let deacons be men of one woman:” γυνή meaning here, as in 1 Cor. ix. 5, a married woman, a wife, and the Romanists here so render it. Now, whether this canon was designed to exclude agamists, or bigamists, or digamists, from the ministry, one thing is very certain, it does not exclude monogamists. It has been variously construed to forbid celibacy, successive or simultaneous bigamy

or polygamy, and second marriages. As the rule obtains in the case of “the widows” mentioned in 1 Tim. v. 9, who must have been each “the wife of one man,” it cannot mean that bishops and deacons must be married, though it is generally best for ministers of every grade, and indeed all other men, to marry; nor does it refer to second marriages, for there may be as good reason (as Origen says) for a minister to marry a second or third time as there was for him to marry the first time. The injunction seems to forbid polygamy of both kinds: they were not to have more than one wife at a time, and if in their previous heathen or Jewish state they had unlawfully divorced their wives, as divorces were common among Jews and heathens, and more than one of their wives were living, they were adjudged unfit for the pastoral or diaconal office, though they might be allowed a place among the laity of the Church, if they afterward restricted themselves to one wife. So a “widow” similarly circumstanced might be a member of the Church, but could not be taken into the number of the “widows indeed,” specified in 1 Tim. v. It was necessary to put the stamp of reprobation upon polygamy and polyandry, which were so common among the Jews and heathens of that age.

Now it is of no consequence whether the bishop in this place is

the same as a presbyter, which we affirm, or of the same order, though higher in office, as the Council of Trent seems to assert; he was what they call "a priest," one of the sacerdotal order. Paul says he might have one wife, no more, at a time; Rome says he shall have none. Does not this make the word of God of none effect by the traditions of men, "forbidding to marry," like the apostates denounced in the next chapter (1 Tim. iv. 3)?

It was very audacious in the Jesuit annotators of the Rhemish version to say in their note on Titus i. 6:

> If any be without crime, the husband of one wife, . . . If the studious reader peruse all antiquity, he shall find all notable bishops and priests of God's Church to have been single or continent from their wives, if any were married before they came to the clergy. So was Paul, and exhorteth all men to the like. So were all the apostles after they followed Christ.

In their note on 1 Tim. iii. 2 they say: "This exposition only is agreeable to the practice of the whole Church, the definition of ancient councils, the doctrine of the Fathers without

exception, and the apostolic tradition." They unblushingly add:

> You may see how shamefully the state of the new heretical clergy of our time is fallen from the apostolic, and all the Fathers' doctrine herein; who do not only take men once or twice married before, but, which was never heard of before in any person or part of the Catholic Church, they marry after they be bishops or priests.

These notes were obviously written for the ignorant and credulous laity of the Romish Communion; but it is amazing that men of learning should perpetuate such arrant falsehoods.

§ 5. Monuments in the Catacombs.

In addition to the testimonies cited in proof that ministers of every grade married in the primitive ages of the Church, we refer to the monuments of the fact found in the Catacombs of Rome, which bring to light what obtained in the metropolis of Christendom, the holy mother Church herself, as the Church at Rome is fondly considered by Romanists.

The Rev. W. H. Withrow, in his excellent work on "The Catacombs of Rome," says (Book III., chap, iv.):

There is no trace of the ascetic spirit or celibate clergy of the Church of Rome in the inscriptions of the Catacombs. On the contrary numerous epitaphs commemorate the honorable marriage of members of every ecclesiastical grade.

He proceeds to furnish a number of specimens of such epitaphs, giving the Latin inscriptions themselves.[1]

§ 6. Historical.

After awhile, however, exaggerated notions of the superior sanctity of celibacy crept into the Church, derived largely from the Jewish Essenes, the Gnostics, Montanists, Encratites, and the like, whose ascetic notions indeed began to inoculate the Church even in the days of the apostles. (See Col. ii. 18–23; I Tim. iv. 1–5.)

Here and there a fanatic dealt out denunciations against the marriage of the clergy; a provincial council, as that of Illibius in Spain, A.D. 300, prohibited it. In 692 the Council in Trullo decreed that bishops must observe celibacy, while presbyters and deacons might live with their wives, though the Roman Church made them promise at their ordination that they would not. The rule laid down by the Council in Trullo has been always observed

since that time in the Greek Church, which allows priests to live with their wives, but not to marry after their ordination.

A long struggle was kept up between the rigid disciplinarians and the more moderate party, the former denouncing all marriage of the clergy, and the latter allowing and practicing it. But the imperious Hildebrand, Pope Gregory VII., set himself to stop it effectually. He held a Council at Rome, A.D. 1074, in which the marriage of priests was condemned as concubinage; and from that time to the present the Romish Church has not allowed its clergy to live in the holy estate of matrimony. Thousands of them have lived, and still live, in illicit relations with women, but marriage is not allowed among them.

In 1076 a synod was held at Winchester, England, which decreed that canons should have no wives, that no priest should marry, and that no bishop should ordain any but celibates, though it allowed priests in the country who were already married to live with their wives. Under Anselm (A.D. 1102) it was declared that

neither priest nor deacon, nor even sub-deacon, should be ordained who did not profess chastity—*i. e.*, celibacy—which decree was confirmed by the Council of London. The Council of Trent followed it up with its canons and curses.

This enforced celibacy of the clergy, in connection with the votive celibacy of monks and nuns, and the detestable confessional, led to such scenes of debauchery among these ecclesiastical orders as are too revolting for portrayal. Those who want to wade through the sloughs of filth which constitute so much of the history of celibacy in the Romish Church are referred to Elliott's "Declineation of Romanism," Book IV., chapter ii., and the works there cited. The decrees and bulls against fornication, sodomy, bestiality, among the clergy, tell the dismal tale.

---

1. See the work mentioned above, pp. 524–526.↩

Chapter II.
The Vow of Celibacy.

480
The article says that “ministers are not commanded by God’s law either to vow the estate of single life, or to abstain from marriage.”

§ 1. Such Vows Find No Support in Scripture.

There is no such command in Scripture; there is no example of such vow, but abundance of testimony to the contrary. Yet Papists have the hardihood to appeal to Scripture for support. They refer to Matt. xix. 11, 12: “But he said unto them, All men cannot receive this saying, save they to whom it is given. For there are some eunuchs, which were so born from their mother’s womb; and there are some eunuchs, which were made eunuchs of men; and there be eunuchs, which have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven’s sake. He that is able to receive it, let him receive it.” But what bearing has this on the subject? Is that any command for the clergy, or any others, to take the vow of celibacy? The passage simply states that there is one class of so-called eunuchs constituted of those who have no natural inclination to marriage or are impotent; another class constituted of those who are mutilated, as by Oriental princes, to take care of their women, or for the purpose of procuring peculiar voices to sing in the Pope’s Sistine Chapel, to the everlasting disgrace of “his Holiness.” Then there is a third class constituted of those who made themselves eunuchs, not in a literal sense (as in the case of Origen), but metaphorically, in the sense of subduing natural inclinations, so as to be at liberty to promote the cause of the gospel in such a way as cannot be done in the married state. (*Cf.* 1 Cor. vii. 26, 34; ix. 5, 15, 16.) In the first instance, a man’s will has nothing to do with the matter; in the second, it is against his will; in the third, it is with his will, concurring, however, with divine aid. Now, our Lord says, “He that is able to receive it, let him receive it;” implying that some cannot live in celibacy, but permitting those to do so who

can and are willing to do it for the kingdom of heaven's sake; otherwise it seems to be the duty of all to marry. (Heb. xiii. 4.)

This passage, therefore, gives no more countenance to the enforced celibacy of the clergy, or of monks and nuns, than Luke xviii. 29, which Bishop Hay absurdly brings forward. He says:

> This is also manifest from the special reward promised by our Saviour, and bestowed in heaven upon those who lead a chaste life: our Saviour says, "Amen, I say unto you, there is no man that hath left house, or parents, or wife, for the kingdom of heaven's sake, who shall not receive much more in this present time, and in the world to come life everlasting."

If he had quoted the parallel passage in Matt. xix. 29, he would have had also children and lands, and brethren and sisters; indeed, some of them are in Luke, and more than all these in Luke xiv. 26: "If any man come to me, and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple." But what do all such passages prove? That it is not lawful for a disciple of Christ to have a wife? Then he must not have parents, brothers, or sisters, or children; he must not have houses or lands; in a word, he must not have himself; he must commit suicide. The plain meaning is, and Bishop Hay could not escape it, that when the cause of Christ demands it, and the kingdom of heaven be thereby promoted, we must part with our most valued possessions, our dearest friends, and even our own lives, looking for the recompense beyond this world.

So of 1 Cor. vii., which is pressed into the argument for the celibacy of the priesthood. There is no reference to ministers apart from others in that chapter. The apostle counsels those of the Corinthians who could do so to remain single, "because of the present distress"—the persecutions and trials through which the Church was passing, when there was frequently but a step between the font and the stake. (1 Cor. xv. 29–32.) They would thus be saved from many cares and anxieties, and attend upon the Lord without distraction. But if they had not the special gift of continence, he advises them to enter into the conjugal state; "for," says he, "it is better to marry than to burn." The whole scope of the chapter is directly against the vow of celibacy, or the enforced state of a single life, no distinction being made between clergy and laity.

Some of the more monastic of Romish polemics press into

their service Rev. xiv. 4: “These are they which were not defiled with women: for they are virgins.” A very slight acquaintance with the style of the Apocalypse would teach them that this has no reference to literal virginity. It simply means that the hundred and forty and four thousand—a symbolical number—there mentioned were free from uncleanness, the symbol of idolatry.

There is one profound argument which we have reserved for the last. Romanists are obliged to admit that in the first age married persons were admitted to the ministerial office; but this, they say, was because other persons were so scarce: our Lord and his apostles, forsooth, would have chosen single men for the ministry, but they were not to be had, so they were obliged to take married men. In after times single men were not scarce, and so they were chosen, and married men rejected. We were going to ask why they were permitted to retain their wives—as we see they were for several centuries—but perhaps it is better to leave that argument unanswered. It will serve to show the utter hopelessness of their cause.

§ 2. Grounds of the Romish Policy.

Any one can see plainly enough why the Pope and the hierarchy of Rome are so strenuous in enforcing the celibacy of the clergy, and of monks and nuns, and why they so hate and denounce Luther, Cranmer, and other Reformers, for breaking the accursed bonds, and proclaiming their freedom. The Pope and his prelates want to have absolute control of the priestly and monastic orders, and so they doom them to a life of celibacy, that they might be made more available as ecclesiastical janizaries, available for all places and occasions throughout their spiritual empire. They are bound by no domestic ties, restricted to no locality, ready at a moment’s notice to go whithersoever their services are needed. This, indeed, gives amazing power to the hierarchy, and wonderfully subserves all its projects and interests; and that is the reason why the oft-repeated and passionate requests of the clergy to be allowed to marry, to save themselves from a life of misery in contending against nature—or doing worse, yielding to its demands by living in debauchery—has been, still is, and is likely to be, persistently and emphatically refused.

§ 3. Jeremy Taylor on Clerical Marriage.

We conclude this discussion by a passage from Jeremy Taylor's
483
curious, learned, and masterly dissertation, "Of the Marriage of Bishops and Priests" ("Works," iii. 579). Speaking of the law requiring celibacy, he says:

> The law of the Church was an evil law, made by an authority violent and usurped, insufficient as to that charge; it was not a law of God; it was against the rights and against the necessities of nature; it was unnatural and unreasonable; it was not for edification of the Church; it was no advantage to spiritual life: it is a law, therefore, that is against public honesty, because it did openly and secretly introduce dishonesty. It had nothing of the requisites of a good law; it had no consideration of human frailty nor of human comforts; it was neither necessary nor profitable nor innocent; neither fitted to time nor place nor person: it was not accepted by them that could not bear it; it was complained of by them that could; it was never admitted in the East; it was fought against and declaimed and railed at in the West; and, at last, is laid aside in the Churches, especially of the north, as the most intolerable and most unreasonable tyranny in the world; for it was not to be endured that, upon the pretense of an unreasonable perfection, so much impurity should be brought into the Church, and so many souls thrust down to hell.

Part X.

Article XXII.
Of the Rites and Ceremonies of Churches.

484

It is not necessary that rites and ceremonies should in all places he the same, or exactly alike; for they have been always different, and may he changed according to the diversity of countries, times, and men's manners, so that nothing be ordained against God's word. Whosoever, through his private judgment, willingly and purposely, doth openly break the rites and ceremonies of the Church to which he belongs, which are not repugnant to the word of God, and are ordained and approved by common authority, ought to be rebuked openly, that others may fear to do the like, as one that offendeth against the common order of the Church, and woundeth the consciences of weak brethren.

Every particular Church may ordain, change, or abolish rites and ceremonies so that all things may be done to edification.

Introduction.

This article corresponds to Article XXXIV. of the Anglican Confession, except a few verbal changes for the better. Thus we have, "It is not necessary that rites and ceremonies should in all places be the same, or exactly alike; for they have been always different," instead of, "It is not necessary that traditions and ceremonies be in all places one, or utterly like; for at all times they have been diverse;" and "rites and ceremonies of the Church to which he belongs, which are not repugnant to the word of God, and are ordained," instead of "traditions and ceremonies of the Church, which be not repugnant to the word of God, and be ordained;" and "one that offendeth," instead of "he that offendeth." The clause "and hurteth the authority of the magistrate" is omitted, perhaps, because it savors of Erastianism;

485

and "the" before "weak." The last sentence is greatly changed. In the Anglican it reads: "Every particular or national Church hath

authority to ordain, change, and abolish ceremonies or rites of the Church, ordained only by man's authority, so that all things be done to edifying." The omission of the word "national" was highly proper, as the article was designed for an ecclesiastical communion in a country where there was no national Church.

Chapter I.
Rites and Ceremonies Defined and Classified.

§ 1. Rites and Ceremonies Defined.

486

It was well to substitute “rites and ceremonies” for “traditions” in the title of the article, and “rites” for “traditions” in the first paragraph, thus conforming it to the language of the second paragraph, “ceremonies or rites.” We use the copulative “and” in this paragraph as in the former. The copulative and disjunctive are used interchangeably in cases like this, where one term is simply explanatory of another. The word tradition in the English article does not refer to doctrine, but to ceremony, which is handed down from age to age. But the term is ill-chosen, and it was well to change it. Bishop Tomline says:

> The word tradition is not here used in the same sense in which it was used in the explanation of the Sixth [our Fifth] Article. It there signified unwritten articles of faith, reputed to be derived from Christ and his apostles: in this article it means customs or practices relative to the external worship of God, which had been delivered down from former times; that is, in the Sixth Article, traditions meant traditional doctrines, of pretended divine authority; and in this it means traditional practices acknowledged to be of human institution.

So Dr. Burnet: “The word means the same as is expressed immediately by the word *ceremonies*, which is only explanatory; and which the Church afterward calls *rites*, supposing them the same with ceremonies.”

Some of the older ritualists distinguish between rites and ceremonies; but they are rather nebulous in their statements. Thus Hook:

> Dr. Nichols says that the cross in baptism, and, it may be, the marriage ring, are perhaps the only ceremonies enjoined in the book of 1662 which can in a strict and proper sense be called so. But, as is observed in a note to Stephen’s Common Prayer Book, with Notes, Dr. Nichols uses ceremony in a limited sense, which is by no means sanctioned by our best writers and divines. *Ceremonie*, in its classical sense, was a general term for worship. Johnson’s definition, *outward rite, external form in religion*, is fully supported

by his references, and especially Hooker, also, throughout his book applies it to all that is external in worship.

487

It seems that *rite* and *ceremony* are thus to be distinguished: A *rite* is an act of religious worship, whether including ceremonies or not; a *ceremony* is any particular of religious worship (included in a rite) which prescribes action, position, or even the assumption of any particular gesture. The latter sense is plainly recognized by Hooker ("Eccl. Pol.," book iv., sec. 1 ; book v., sec. 29.) The preface to the Book of Common Prayer speaks first of *common prayer*, viz., the offices intended of the common and periodical use of *all* at stated times; next, of the administration of the sacrament; next, of other rites and ceremonies—*i. e.*, the occasional services, whether public or private, and all the methods of administration which these involved. Now among ceremonies, the prescribed procession in the marriage and burial services, the standing at certain parts of the service, the bowing at the name of Jesus as prescribed by the eighteenth canon, ought to be included.

It may be observed that the eighteenth canon expressly calls the bowing just mentioned a ceremony, as also, in the thirtieth canon, the sign of the cross. (See Hooker, book iii., sec. 11, and book v., sec. 6.) Neither the word *rite* nor *tradition* is used in the preface of the Prayer Book. The word *ceremony* is there used exactly in the same sense as that in which all these words are used in the article; indeed, the one is evidently copied from the other. In treating of "Ceremonies: Why Some be Abolished and Some Retained," the preface says:

> Of such ceremonies as be used in the Church, and have had their beginning by the institution of man, some at the first were of good intent and purpose devised, and yet at length turned to vanity and superstition; some entered into the Church by indiscreet devotion, and such a zeal as was without knowledge; and for because they were winked at in the beginning, they grew daily to more and worse abuses, which not only for their unprofitableness, but also because they have much blinded the people, and obscured the glory of God, are worthy to be cut away and clean rejected; others there be, which, although they have been devised by man, yet it is thought good to reserve them still as well for a decent order in the Church (for the which they were first devised) as because they pertain to edification, whereunto all things done in the Church (as the apostle teacheth) ought to be referred.

The preface then proceeds to discuss the principles laid down in the article.

That the words are here used synonymously may be inferred from their use in the Augsburg Confession, Art. XV., where the Latin

title is, *De Ritibus Ecclesiasticis*, and the English, "Of Religious Ceremonies," "*De Ritibus Ecclesiasticis docent*," says the Latin article, "*quod ritus*," etc. In the English:

> Concerning Ecclesiastical Ceremonies, they teach that these ceremonies ought to be observed, which can be attended to without sin, and which promote peace and good order in the Church, such as certain holy days, festivals, etc. Concerning matters of this kind, however, caution should be observed, lest the consciences
>
> 488
>
> of men be burdened as though such observances were necessary to salvation. Men should also be apprised that human traditionary observances, instituted with a view to appease God, to merit his favor, and make satisfaction for sins, are contrary to the gospel and the doctrine of faith. Wherefore vows and traditionary observances concerning meats, days, etc., instituted to merit grace and make satisfaction for sins, are useless and contrary to the gospel.

Webster's definition of "rite" is generally accepted: "The act of performing divine or solemn service, as established by law, precept, or custom; formal act of religion, or other solemn duty; a religious ceremony or usage. Synonyms: form; ceremony; observance; ordinance." "Ceremony" he defines: "Outward rite, external form in religion."

So Watson:

> Ceremony, an assemblage of several actions, forms, and circumstances, serving to render a thing magnificent and solemn. Applied to religious service, it signifies the external rites and manner in which the ministers of religion perform their sacred functions, and direct or lead the worship of the people.

§ 2. Two Kinds of Ceremonies.

It would have been well, perhaps, if the Reformers had confined themselves to the use of one word, namely, "ceremonies."

Of these there are obviously two kinds. The first kind consists of all those acts which are appointed in the celebration of those parts of divine worship which are required in the holy Scriptures. There must be public prayer, psalmody, reading and expounding the Scriptures, administration of the sacraments, ordination to the ministry, exercise of discipline, and the like. But the Scriptures nowhere prescribe in what manner these acts shall be performed.

Some modes must be agreed upon, or there can be no public worship or discipline in the Church. Then there is a second kind, which, by general consent, is considered expedient and good to the use of edifying; these consist of special services for matrimony, burial of the dead, dedication of churches, commemoration of the great facts of Christianity, and occasional fasting, thanksgiving, and other solemnities. These services, and the manner in which they are to be conducted, come within the provision of this article and of that in the Augsburg Confession.

Chapter II.
The Two Classes of Ceremonies.

§ 1. Ceremonies: Required and Expedient.

489

With regard to the first class of ceremonies none but fanatics take any exception to them.

With regard to the second (including also the first) Nicholls says:

Ceremony is of Latin origin, though some of the best critics in antiquity are divided in their opinions, in assigning from what original it is derived. Joseph Scaliger proves by analogy that as *sanctimonia* comes from *sanctus*, so does *ceremonia* from the old Latin *cerus*, which signifies sacred, or holy.[1] The Christian writers have adopted the word to signify external rites and customs in the worship of God, which, though they are not of the essence of religion, yet contribute much to good order and conformity in the Church. If there were no ornaments in the Church, and no prescribed order of administration, the common people could hardly be persuaded to show more reverence in the sacred assemblies than in other ordinary places, where they meet only for business or diversion. Upon this account St. Augustin says: "No religion, either true or false, can subsist without some ceremonies." Notwithstanding this, some persons have laid it down as a fundamental principle of religion, that no ceremony or human constitution is justifiable, but what is expressly narrated in the word of God. This dogma Mr. Cartwright has reduced into a syllogistical demonstration: "Wheresoever faith is wanting, there is sin: in every action not commanded faith is wanting; ergo, in every action not commanded there is sin." But the falsity of this syllogism is shown at large by Hooker in his second book of "Ecclesiastical Polity," by arguments drawn from the indifference of many human actions, from the natural liberty God has afforded us, from the examples of holy men in Scripture who have differently used this liberty, and from the power which the Church by divine authority is vested with. That apostolical injunction, "Let all things be done with decency and in order" (1 Cor. xiv. 40), is a much better demonstration that the Church has a power to enjoin proper ceremonies for the good order and comeliness of ecclesiastical conventions than Mr. Cartwright's syllogism is for the contempt of them when enjoined.

§ 2. Ceremonies Lawful.

That it is not wrong to use ceremonies which are not positively
490
prescribed in the Scriptures is evident from the example of our Lord and his disciples. There is no divine prescription on record for the synagogue worship; for the Feast of Dedication; for the recumbent position at the Passover, which was first eaten standing; for the canonical hours of prayer; for the use of wine in the Passover; for the tithing of herbs, etc.; yet Christ and his disciples complied with all these observances which were then established in the Jewish Church. Calvin, Bruce, and others of the Reformed or Presbyterian party—not to mention Luther and his followers—objected not to the use of ceremonies of human constitution, certain gestures, vestments, liturgies, and the like. They only insisted that they should be few and simple, free from all taint of superstition, and helps, not hinderances, to devotion.

§ 3. By What Authority Shall Ceremonies be Prescribed?

The great question is, By what authority shall these ceremonies be prescribed?

The English Reformers, who were Erastian in their views, associate the magistrate with the Church, and speak of “every particular or national Church,” as having the authority. This was designed to oppose papal usurpation. The Pope had erased all distinctions between national Churches, in order to have uniformity of discipline and worship, as well as of doctrine. He could not, indeed, do this absolutely; there always have been diversities of administration—not only in the primitive Church, where uniformity was not cared for, but also after the supremacy of the Pope was recognized. The Council of Basle, in 1433, allowed a branch of the Hussites to commune in both kinds; hence they are called “Calixtines.” At the Synod of Brest-Litofsky in 1596, headed by the Metropolitan of Kieff, many who had adhered to the Greek faith in Galicia, Hungary, Poland, and Little Russia, submitted to the Pope, but rejected the *Filioque* and retained the Slavonic language and ritual in their worship. These were called Uniates, or United Greeks.

In England, before the Reformation, as the Preface to the Prayer Book says, "Heretofore there has been great diversity in saying and singing in churches within this realm; some following Salisbury use, some Hereford use, and some the use of Bangor, some of York, some of Lincoln." The pope would have reduced them all to uniformity; but he was not omnipotent, though he professed

to be infallible. Even now, what a difference there is in the manner in which Papists celebrate worship in enlightened Protestant countries and in Romish countries.

However, the Romish theory is, that there are to be no differences occasioned by various countries, peoples, languages, and the like; all such distinctions are ignored, Rome governs the world.

Now, in opposition to this arrogant assumption, the Anglican Reformers held that "every particular or national Church hath authority" in the premises. They were essentially Erastian. Thus in the Thirty-sixth Article, the "Book of Consecration of Archbishops and Bishops, and Ordering of Priests and Deacons" is spoken of as "confirmed by authority of Parliament;" and the Thirty-seventh Article asserts the Queen's supremacy in Church as well as State, only restricting her majesty from "ministering God's word or the sacraments." Article XXI. says, "General Councils may not be gathered together without the commandment and will of princes." No Bishop can be consecrated without the *congé d'élire* of the Crown. No act of that sham synod called "Convocation" is of any binding force till sanctioned by Parliament, while Parliament can pass what act it pleases touching the Church, establishing or disestablishing, endowing or disendowing it. Lay courts determine which of contending parties are right or wrong in regard to baptism and the tremendously important matters of *orientation*, vestments, lights, incense, and other ceremonies in administering the Lord's-supper, and the like. If all this is not Erastianism, we should like for Mr. Wheatley to tell us what it is.

Now, the article as we have it revised, keeps us from both extremes: popish assumption on the one hand, and Erastianism on the other. We suffer neither pope nor Caesar to meddle with our religion. We will receive both into our communion on the same terms on which we receive any other repentant sinner; but they must be subject to the authority of the Church, and not attempt to usurp authority over it.

By a particular Church our article does not mean a national Church—we recognize no national Church—nor does it mean a separate congregation, according to the principles of independency. We do not, indeed, deny that any company of Christians, small or large, may unite together on an independent platform,

and agree upon a form of doctrine, discipline, and worship, to suit themselves. In that case, the principle of the article still holds; for no member of that particular Church is at liberty, "through his private judgment, willingly and purposely, to openly break the rites and ceremonies of the Church to which he belongs." If he does this, he ought "to be rebuked openly;" and if he persists in his contumacious course, he must be excluded from the fellowship of that particular Church. No other authority is needed for this but simply the law of self-preservation, which belongs to bodies ecclesiastical as well as to bodies civil and social, or to the individual. In cases of this sort the apostle considered it sufficient to say: "But if any man seem to be contentious, we have no such custom, neither the churches of God." (1 Cor. xi. 16; *cf.* 1 Cor. xiv.)

If several of such local societies unite together for their mutual benefit and greater efficacy, they constitute a particular Church in another sense. They agree, either in general convention, or by their representatives, to conform to a certain platform of discipline and worship, as well as doctrine. They enter the Connection voluntarily; they voluntarily remain in it. While they are in it they are bound by laws of their own enactment to conform to this platform while they remain in the fellowship of this particular or connectional Church. If any of the constituent bodies of this Connection, or any individual belonging to them, "openly break the rites and ceremonies" of the Connection into which they have entered, they ought to be rebuked openly, as they act contumaciously and in bad faith, "offending against the common order of the Church, and wounding the consciences of weak brethren."

Order is heaven's first law.

To maintain order there must be authority and government. This correlates subjection and obedience.

§ 4. Conclusion.

L'Estrange says:

It may be objected that my superior may enjoin me such a law as my conscience tells me is scandalous to my brother, not convenient, not edifying, etc. What shall I do in this condition? If I conform, I sin against my conscience (Rom. xiv. 23); if I do not, I sin against his authority. Answer: That text of Rom. xiv. 23 hath only reference to things not only indifferent in their own nature, but left free from any superior command interposing, and therefore the text

is not *ad idem*; for though such laws may be of things indifferent, yet being commanded by just authority, the indifference by that command determineth, and they become necessary.

This is a sound principle, however much it may be abused by Papists on the one hand and by Erastians on the other. Christianity makes no provision for solitary discipleship. It develops itself into a living organism. The Church, or society of the faithful, is not a mere accident of Christianity; it is normal, visceral, essential; religion would become extinct without it. All who were converted by the ministry of the apostles and their associates were instantly incorporated into the Church. It may well be supposed that in many instances those thus incorporated would have preferred other ceremonies to those which were established in the particular Church into which they were admitted. But what of that? Was there ever a society—benevolent, political, ecclesiastical, or of any other kind—in which the preferences of every individual member were met? The thing is preposterous. Particular preferences have to be relinquished in view of the advantages derived from the association. If, after uniting with any particular Church, a man satisfies himself that some of the ceremonies are contrary to the word of God, and not tending to edification, and he cannot get them changed, he should withdraw from its communion. This was the case with the Reformers. They believed that many things required by the Romish Church in worship and discipline, as well as in doctrine, are contrary to the word of God, and not conducive to edification; they protested against these things, but they could effect no reformation in that communion. There was but one thing to do—that is, to leave the Romish Church, which they did, though at the peril of their property, liberty, and lives. In doing this they were not guilty of schism; the schism lies at the door of the Romish Church, which exacted of them unscriptural terms of membership.

So with regard to Dissenters from the National Established Church of England. Many who were born and bred in that Church, as well as others who were not, were led to believe that the union of Church and State—whether according to the Papal platform as set forth in the Syllabus, by which the State is subjected to the Church; or the Erastian platform, by which the Church is subjected to the State—is contrary to God's word,

and not conducive to edification; and moreover, that there are certain ceremonies and disciplinary rules, as well as doctrines, prescribed by that politico-ecclesiastical body, which they consider repugnant to the same. What was their duty in the premises? Most obviously, to leave that communion. For doing this the Erastian Anglicans (as in the other case the Papists) charged them with schism, but very unjustly. If there be any schism in the case, it lies at the door of the Established Church, which made these unscriptural exactions.

Those who are set for the defense of Article XXXIV. and Article XXXVII. in the Anglican Confession are greatly to be pitied; for surely there is no authority for Erastianism in the New Testament or in the Ante-Nicene Fathers.

The use which the dominant Church made of those passages in the Prophets which speak of kings being nursing fathers and their queens nursing mothers of the Church, sucking the breasts of kings, and the like, after the conversion of Constantine—and among Protestants since the Reformation—will not much recommend Erastianism to the candid student of Church history.

---

1. Webster states that *Caerimonia* comes "from *Caere*, an old city of Etruria, which stood in a very ancient relidous connection with Rome; according to others, from *Ceres*, equivalent to *Cereris sacra*."—T.↩

Book VIII.
Christian Ethics; or, Moral Theology.

I. 495
Of the Rulers of the United States of America (Article XXIII.)
II. Of Christian Men's Goods. (Article XXIV.)
III. Of a Christian Man's Oath. (Article XXV).

Part I.

Article XXIII.
Of the Rulers of the United States of America.

497

The President, the Congress, the general assemblies, the governors, and the councils of state, as the delegates of the people, are the rulers of the United States of America, according to the division of power made to them by the Constitution of the United States, and the Constitution of their respective States. And the said States are a sovereign and independent nation, and ought not to be subject to any foreign jurisdiction.[1]

Introduction.

This article seems out of place in the Confession. Indeed, it was not placed there by Wesley. He very properly omitted all the politico-ecclesiastical articles in abridging the Anglican Confession for the Methodist Episcopal Church in America. The Twenty-four Articles, as he prepared them, were printed by his direction in London in 1784, before the Christmas Conference of that year, at which the Church was organized and the liturgy and articles were adopted. He inserted in the liturgy "A Prayer for the Supreme Rulers," in which they are styled "the supreme rulers of these United States." That seemed to him sufficient. But the patriotic fathers of the Church thought otherwise, and so they framed this article, and numbered it XXIII.

Some changes from the original reading were required when the government under the Articles of Confederation became the government under the Constitution.

498

In 1790 "The President" was inserted before "the Congress," and in 1804 "the Constitution of the United States" was substituted for "the general Act of Confederation;" and the words "are a sovereign and independent nation, and" were inserted in the last sentence.

In 1820 the General Conference appended a note to the article,

to meet the special case of the Methodists in Canada who then belonged to the Methodist Episcopal Church, and against whom unfounded suspicions had been created, as that Church was considered a foreign ecclesiastical body. In 1858 our General Conference substituted “any foreign government” for “the British or any other government.”

[A few words of general introduction to this Book on “Christian Ethics” may here be added. Unlike the preceding Books, it does not attempt completely to cover the field defined by its title. The three articles included in it evidently do not exhaust the topics included in moral theology; nevertheless, all the subjects contained in and suggested by the three articles fall within these general limits, and the title prefixed is the only one at once sufficiently general to include, and sufficiently definite to point out, the subject-matter. This brevity is the more pardonable for two reasons: (1) Ethics, or moral philosophy, is universally recognized as a distinct branch of study in all our American institutions of learning; moreover, as taught in these institutions, it incorporates the elements of Christian morals and is pervaded and dominated by essentially Christian ideas. (2) Moral theology is not essential to the completeness and integrity of a system of Christian dogmatics. The scientific treatment of dogma, or doctrine, is independent of the scientific treatment of ethics, or practice, and there is an increasing tendency among theologians to divorce these two departments of inquiry. In the Roman Catholic system, moral theology assumes greater importance because Rome regards morality no less than dogma as a body of positive definitions and precepts constructed and imposed by the authority of the Church. The writer has, however, made some additions where Dr. Summers’s treatment seemed exceptionally brief, and discussions of the morals of Christianity are found throughout the preceding pages, as in Book V., Part II., Chap. IV., on the “Eternal Obligation of the Moral Law.” Compare Introduction, in Vol. I., Chap. I., §§ 1, 4.]

---

1. As far as it respects civil affairs, we believe it the duty of Christians, and especially all Christian ministers, to be subject to the supreme authority of the country where they may reside, and to use all laudable means to enjoin obedience to the powers that be; and,

therefore, it is expected that all our preachers and people, who may be under any foreign government, will behave themselves as peaceable and orderly subjects.↩

Chapter I.
The Christian and the State.

§ 1. The Article Devoid of Party Significance.

499
It is hardly necessary to observe that neither the article itself nor the *note* appended has any political bearing. It settles no question as to the claims of Imperialists, Royalists, Oligarchists, Republicans, or Democrats, to say nothing of minor distinctions. It has nothing to do with the right of revolution, nullification, secession, or consolidation.

§ 2. Doctrine of the Scriptures.

The article merely affirms that in the character of Christians, and especially as Christian ministers, we have to obey the powers that be—the *de facto* government, while it lasts—whether the chief ruler be a Nero, a George III., or a Washington. This is the teaching of Christ and the apostles. Matt. xxii. 15–22: “Then went the Pharisees, and took counsel how they might entangle him in his talk. And they sent out unto him their disciples with the Herodians, saying, Master, we know that thou art true, and teachest the way of God in truth, neither carest thou for any man: for thou regardest not the person of men. Tell us therefore, What thinkest thou? Is it lawful to give tribute unto Caesar, or not? But Jesus perceived their wickedness, and said, Why tempt ye me, ye hypocrites? Shew me the tribute money. And they brought unto him a penny. And he saith unto them, Whose is this image and superscription? They say unto him, Caesar’s. Then saith he unto them, Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar’s; and unto God the things that are God’s. When they had heard these words, they marveled, and left him, and went their way.” Luke xii. 14: “And he said unto him, Man, who made me a judge or a divider over you?” John xviii. 36, 37: “Jesus answered, My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I

should not be delivered to the Jews; but now is my kingdom not from hence. Pilate therefore said unto him, Art thou a king then? Jesus answered, Thou sayest that I am a king.

500

To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth. Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice." Acts xvi. 35–40; xxv. 10–12: "And when it was day, the magistrates sent the serjeants, saying, Let those men go. And the keeper of the prison told this saying to Paul, The magistrates have sent to let you go; now therefore depart, and go in peace. But Paul said unto them, They have beaten us openly uncondemned, being Romans, and have cast us into prison; and now do they thrust us out privily? nay verily; but let them come themselves and fetch us out. And the serjeants told these words unto the magistrates: and they feared, when they heard that they were Romans. And they came and besought them, and brought them out, and desired them to depart out of the city. And they went out of the prison, and entered into the house of Lydia: and when they had seen the brethren, they comforted them, and departed." "Then said Paul, I stand at Caesar's judgment seat, where I ought to be judged: to the Jews have I done no wrong, as thou very well knowest. For if I be an offender, or have committed any thing worthy of death, I refuse not to die: but if there be none of these things whereof these accuse me, no man may deliver me unto them. I appeal unto Caesar. Then Festus, when he had conferred with the council, answered, Hast thou appealed unto Caesar? unto Caesar shalt thou go." Rom. xiii. 1–7: "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God; and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation. For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same: for he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain; for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience' sake. For, for this cause pay ye tribute also: for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing. Render therefore to all their dues; tribute to whom tribute is due;

custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor." 1 Tim. ii. 1, 2; vi. 1–5: "I exhort therefore,

that, first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made for all men; for kings, and for all that are in authority; that we may earn a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty." "Let as many servants as are under the yoke count their own masters worthy of all honor, that the name of God and his doctrine be not blasphemed. And they that have believing masters, let them not despise them, because they are brethren; but rather do them service, because they are faithful and beloved, partakers of the benefit. These things teach and exhort. If any man teach otherwise, and consent not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness; he is proud, knowing nothing, but doting about questions and strifes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings, perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the truth, supposing that gain is godliness: from such withdraw thyself." Titus iii. 1: "Put them in mind to be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates, to be ready to every good work." 1 Pet. ii. 13–17: "Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake: whether it be to the king, as supreme; or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by him for the punishment of evil doers, and for the praise of them that do well. For so is the will of God, that with well doing ye may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men: as free, and not using your liberty for a cloak of maliciousness, but as the servants of God. Honor all men. Love the brotherhood. Fear God. Honor the king."

Chapter II.
Political Ethics.

§ 1. Dr. Pope on Political Ethics.

502

[Divine revelation has from the beginning been bound up with government, and the social and political affairs of the world. Its history shows the sanctification of every form of developing rule among men; from the primitive household and family, its simplest and typical form, to the most violent form of imperial despotism. We have now to do with the final teaching of the New Testament, about which there is little room for doubt. Its general principles are very plain, both as to the rulers and as to the ruled.

I. The institution of government is divine: not founded on any compact or agreement among men, as the modern figment is.[1] The more carefully we examine the basis of tribal and national distinctions among men—in other words, what goes to constitute a distinct people—the more clearly shall we perceive that it is conditioned by a certain relation to God whose worship was the original bond of unity to every race, and whose representative the earthly ruler was. Government was made for man and man was also made for it. The form of that government is not prescribed rigidly and definitively: certainly not in the Christian legislation. Every form of valid authority is sanctified in the Old Testament. The New Testament introduces a universal monarchy in the spiritual economy of things; and only in a very subordinate way deals with the kingdom of this world. But the foundations of civil and political society for earth were laid in heaven: the powers that be are ordained of God. Human magistrates represent the Supreme Judge: being in the state his deputies. He is the minister of God to thee for good: for the protection and peace of the law-abiding. He is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath: for the administration of the divine justice on transgressors. These principles are indisputable. The same term is used concerning the representation of ecclesiastical authority in the Church and civil authority in the world: they are both διάκονοι and λειτουργοί, or ministers.

II. Obedience to magistrates and the government of the land is made part of the Christian law: expressly included in his ethics by our Lord on the broad ground of the duty to “render therefore unto Caesar the things that are Caesar’s,” though the Caesar of that day held the land in bondage. St. Paul recognized in his own person, and commands all men to recognize, what was at best a despotic and cruel authority.

1. The duty of submission is, first, in a certain sense, passive. "Whosoever,

503

therefore, resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God; and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation" [judgment, condemnation]. This forbids, negatively, personal insurrection and resistance. How far submission is to be carried, at what point resistance is permitted—not to the individual as such, but to a people—is a question which our present ethics do not contemplate. *Inter arma leges silent.* The obligation comes in, however, before the arms are taken up. No individual Christian may resist without betraying his trust, and losing the meekness of his wisdom. When the question is "concerning the law of his God" (Dan. vi. 5), the servant of Jehovah must resist, but not until submission has had its perfect work.

2. Positively, obedience to the government requires that diligence be given to uphold the honor of the law at all points, and that *for conscience' sake.* Much emphasis is laid both by our Lord and by his apostles on paying tribute to whom tribute is due: a principle which involves very important issues. "For this cause pay ye tribute also." Let it be observed that St. Paul's ethics of submission to government follow, and are, as it were, incorporated with, his sublimest and most comprehensive doctrine of Christian morality.

3. The Bible from beginning to end inculcates and honors *patriotism*. It has been sometimes said that neither the sentiment of love to country nor that of personal friendship finds a place in Christian ethics. It is true that the supreme devotion to a kingdom which is not of this world everywhere has the pre-eminence; and that the individual sympathies of friendship are merged in brotherly love. But both these sentiments are really inculcated and encouraged. There is no profane history that surpasses or equals its annals in examples of both, and Christianity must have the benefit of the old religion of which it is in a certain sense a continuation.[2]]

§ 2. Dr. Hodge on Obedience to Civil Magistrates.

[Dr. Charles Hodge, in substantial harmony with Dr. Pope, but from a cis-Atlantic stand-point, and in somewhat closer sympathy with American ideas and institutions, treats the subject as follows:

The whole theory of civil government and the duty of citizens to their rulers are comprehensively stated by the apostle in Romans xiii. 1–5. It is there taught: (1) That all authority is of God. (2) That civil magistrates are ordained of God. (3) That resistance to them is resistance to him; they are ministers exercising his authority among men. (4) That obedience to them must be rendered as a matter of conscience, as a part of our obedience to

God.

From this it appears: First, that civil government is a divine ordinance. It is not merely an optional human institution; something which men are free to have or not to have, as they see fit. It is not founded on any social compact; it is something which God commands. The Bible, however, does not teach that there is any one form of civil government which is always and everywhere obligatory. The form of government is determined by the providence of God and the will of the people. It changes as the state of society changes. Much less is it implied in the proposition that government is a divine institution, that God designates

the persons who are to exercise the various functions of the government; or the mode of their appointment; or the extent of their powers.

Secondly, it is included in the apostle's doctrine, that magistrates derive their authority from God; they are his ministers; they represent him. In a certain sense they represent the people, as they may be chosen by them to be the depositaries of this divinely delegated authority; but the powers that be are ordained by God; it is his will that they should be, and that they should be clothed with authority.

Thirdly, from this it follows that obedience to magistrates and to the laws of the land, is a religious duty. We are to submit to "every ordinance of man," for the Lord's sake, out of our regard to him, as St. Peter expresses it, or for "conscience' sake," as the same idea is expressed by St. Paul. We are bound to obey magistrates not merely because we have promised to do so; or because we have appointed them; or because they are wise or good; but because such is the will of God. In like manner the laws of the land are to be observed, not because we approve of them, but because God has enjoined such obedience. This is a matter of great importance; it is the only stable foundation of civil government and of social order. There is a great difference between obedience to man and obedience to God; between lying to man and lying to God; and between resistance to man and resistance to God. This principle runs through the Bible, which teaches that all authority is of God, and therefore all obedience to those in authority is part of our obedience to God. This applies not only to the cases of citizens and rulers, but also to parents and children, husbands and wives, and even masters and slaves. In all these relations we are to act not as the servants of men, but as the servants of God. This gives to authority, by whomsoever exercised, a divine sanction; it gives it power over the conscience; and it elevates even menial service into an element of the glorious liberty of the sons of God. No man can have a servile spirit who serves God in rendering obedience to men. None but a law-abiding people can be free or prosperous; and no people can be permanently law-abiding who do not truly believe that "the powers that be are ordained of God." "Whosoever, therefore, resisteth the power (them in authority), resisteth the ordinance of God; and they that

resist shall receive to themselves damnation (κρῖμα).” That is, God will punish them.

Fourthly, another principle included in the apostle’s doctrine is that obedience is due to every *de facto* government, whatever its origin or character. His directions were written under the reign of Nero, and enjoined obedience to him. The early Christians were not called to examine the credentials of their actual rulers every time the praetorian guard chose to depose one emperor and install another. The people of England were not free from their obligation to William and Mary when once established on the throne, because they might think that James II. was entitled to the crown. We are to obey “the powers that be.” They are in authority by the will of God, which is revealed by facts as clearly as by words. It is by him that “kings reign and princes decree justice.” “He raiseth up one and putteth down another.”

Fifthly, the Scriptures clearly teach that no human authority is intended to be unlimited. Such limitation may not be expressed, but it is always implied. The command “Thou shalt not kill” is unlimited in form, yet the Scriptures recognize that homicide may in some cases be not only justifiable but obligatory. The

principles which limit the authority of civil government and of its agents are simple and obvious. The first is that governments and magistrates have authority only within their legitimate spheres. As civil government is instituted for the protection of life and property, for the preservation of order, for the punishment of evil-doers, and for the praise of those who do well, it has only to do with the conduct or external acts of men. It cannot concern itself with their opinions, whether scientific, philosophical, or religious. An act of Parliament or of Congress, that Englishmen or Americans should be materialists or idealists, would be an absurdity and a nullity. The magistrate cannot enter our families and assume parental authority, or our Churches and teach as a minister. A justice of the peace cannot assume the prerogatives of a governor or of a president of the United States. Out of his legitimate sphere a magistrate ceases to be a magistrate. A second limitation is no less plain. No human authority can make it obligatory on a man to disobey God. If all power is from God, it cannot be legitimate when used against God. This is self-evident. The apostles, when forbidden to preach the gospel, refused to obey. When Daniel refused to bow down to the image that Nebuchadnezzar had made, when the early Christians refused to worship idols, and when the Protestant martyrs refused to profess the errors of the Romish Church, they all commended themselves to God, and secured the reverence of all good men. On this point there can be no dispute. It is important that this principle should be not only recognized, but also publicly avowed. The sanctity of law and the stability of human governments depend on the sanction of

God. Unless they repose on him, they rest on nothing. They have his sanction only when they act according to his will; that is, in accordance with the design of their appointment and in harmony with the moral law.

Sixthly, another general principle is that the question when the civil government may be and ought to be disobeyed, is one which every man must decide for himself. It is a matter of private judgment. Every man must answer for himself to God, and therefore every man must judge for himself whether a given act is sinful or not. Daniel judged for himself. So did Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego. So did the apostles, and so did the martyrs.

An unconstitutional law or commandment is a nullity; no man sins in disregarding it. He disobeys, however, at his peril. If his judgment is right, he is free. If he be wrong, in the view of the proper tribunal, he must suffer the penalty. There is an obvious distinction to be made between disobedience and resistance. A man is bound to disobey a law, or a command, which requires him to sin, but it does not follow that he is at liberty to resist its execution. The apostles refused to obey the Jewish authorities: but they submitted to the penalty inflicted. So the Christian martyrs disobeyed the laws requiring them to worship idols, but they made no resistance to the execution of the law. The Quakers disobey the laws requiring military service, but quietly submit to the penalty. This is obviously right. The right of resistance is in the community. It is the right of revolution, which God sanctions, and which good men in past ages have exercised to the salvation of civil and religious liberty. When a government fails to answer the purpose for which God ordained it, the people have a right to change it. A father, if he shamefully abuses his powers, may rightly be deprived of authority over his children.[3]]

---

1. Man is by nature a social and political animal, as Aristotle phrases it, and thus the Creator has grounded government in man's constitution and in the nature of things. Moreover all civil rule is ordained of God, nor did govemment as such originate in voluntary social compact. This is a mere theory devoid of historical foundation. All of this, however, is consistent with that other truth that existing particular goveniments derive their just powers from the tacit or expiess consent of the governed.—T.↩
2. Pope, "Compendium," etc., Vol. III., pp. 251–253.↩
3. "Systematic Theology," Vol. III., pp. 357–360.↩

Part II.

Article XXIV.
Of Christian Men's Goods.

506

The riches and goods of Christians are not common, as touching the right, title, and possession of the same, as some do falsely boast. Notwithstanding, every man ought, of such things as he possesseth, liberally to give alms to the poor according to his ability.

Introduction.

This article is the same as Article XXXVIII. in the Anglican Confession, except that the title of the latter is this: "Of Christian Men's Goods Which Are Not Common," which limits the article to a repudiation of the community of goods; and it has "certain Anabaptists," where we have the more general word, "some."

Chapter I.
Communism.

§ 1. Historical.

507

This change was obviously proper because communism has been inculcated in every age from a remote antiquity, and it is proper to have a standing protest against it. It was a leading element in the ancient Buddhistic and Pythagorean systems. Plato laid great stress upon it in his work on the Ideal State, extending it to the community of women as well as of goods. His leading views were advocated by the Neo-Platonic philosopher, Plotinus. The Therapeutac and Essenes, among the Jews, were also communists. A communistic sentiment was developed among the early Christians, which crystallized into the monastic system. It was advocated and practiced by various heretical bodies, as the Apostolici mentioned by Augustin, who renounced marriage as well as property; and the Eustathians, who were condemned by the Council of Gangra. In after times arose the Humiliates, the Beghards (male), the Beguins (female), the Brethren and Sisters of the Free Spirit, and the Adamites, who carried their principles as far as Plato, and who were suppressed by the Hussite leader Ziska. The Agrarianism, which gave an impulse to the Peasants' War at the time of the Reformation, developed into the communism of "The Heavenly Prophets," founded by Nicholas Storch in 1521, and more fully in the revolting doctrines and practices of Münzer and the Anabaptists; the Libertines of Geneva, opposed by Calvin; and the Familists of England and Holland about 1545. In a milder form the communistic element was embodied in the society of the Moravians at Herrnhut, and in some communities of Auvergne, and the Shakers of the United States. Roger Bacon in his "New Atlantis," Thomas More in his "Utopia," Harrington in his "Oceana," favored communism, and the Buchanites of Scotland, in the eighteenth century, reduced the theory to practice; but their society did not last more than half a century. They were followed by the Owenites in England, Scotland, and the United States, under

Robert Owen and Abram Combe; but they soon came to naught. The Chartists followed in their wake.

The French Revolution gave birth to communistic ideas which produced fearful results. The Utopianism of the Revolutionists was based on atheism. Then came St. Simonism, Fourierism, Lamennaisism, Proudhonism, Icarianism, and other socialistic systems in France, and similar societies in Switzerland, Germany, Belgium, Italy, America, and other countries. The last and least appears to be the Rugby folly, founded by Thomas Hughes, of old Rugby fame. Before the exotic took root in Tennessee, it withered away. Some of these communistic bodies advocated celibacy, as the Shakers and German Seventh-day Baptists, and others; or the community of women, as the Oneida Communists. It is needless to say that communism has been denounced as a heresy by the Church in every age.

§ 2. The Scriptural Doctrine.

Burnet shrewdly remarks:

> There is no great difficulty in this article, as there is no danger to be apprehended that the opinion condemned by it is likely to spread. Those may be for it who find it for them. The poor may lay claim to it, but few of the rich will ever go into it. The whole charge that is given in the Scripture for charity and alms-giving; all the rules that are given to the *rich*, and to *masters*, to whom their servants were then properties and slaves, do clearly demonstrate that the gospel was not designed to introduce a community of goods.

The scriptural support sought for communism rests on a false exegesis of two or three passages.

Our Lord said to the rich young ruler, “If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell that thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come and follow me.” (Matt. xix. 21.) So he said to his disciples, “Sell that ye have, and give alms; provide yourselves bags which wax not old, a treasure in the heavens that faileth not.” (Luke xii. 33.) Those and similar instructions do not countenance voluntary poverty or community of goods, which was never enjoined, but only practiced in a specific case for specific ends. The rich ruler could not follow Christ in his itinerancy, and

preach the gospel, while he was fettered by his houses and lands, upon which his affections were unduly set; hence the requisition in his case. So Peter and the other apostles left all and followed Christ; they gave up their fishing-boats and nets, their toll-booths, and other positions

and occupations, as they were to devote themselves exclusively to the work of the ministry in all parts of the world. The requisition made of them was not in the interest of poverty or of communism; much less was it intended to operate as a general confiscation of property among all who embraced the gospel. Indeed, Peter retained the proprietorship of his house at Capernaum, and he and others apparently of their fishing-boats (*cf.* John xxi.); John had a home at Jerusalem, and so had Mark, or his mother had; and others (ministers as well as laymen) had houses and lands, as well as other property, which they were not required to confiscate to the Church.

But the great passage relied on by the communists is Acts ii. 44, 45: "And all that believed were together, and had all things common; and sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men, as every man had need." This was one of the remarkable phenomena presented at the great Christian Pentecost. Thousands of believers were at Jerusalem during the feast, and for some time after. (Acts iv. 4, 34–37.) As they were ostracised by the unbelieving Jews, some provision had to be made for their sustenance: this was done by the voluntary offerings of those who had means. No law was necessary: they acted under the impulse of their newborn love. Some of them went so far as to sell their landed property to procure means to protract this Pentecostal meeting. As Jesus and the twelve apostles had but one purse, all sharing together from the common stock (though some of them retained the ownership of property which there was no occasion to sell), so in this case, whatever was needed by the community of believers was supplied by those who had it. There was no compulsion, and there was no withholding, except in one painful instance. (Acts v. 1–11.) It was a temporary expedient, not a precedent for future times. Joses Barnabas is specified, among others, as one who sold his land, and brought the money and laid it at the apostles' feet. But Ananias and Sapphira, having sold a possession, kept back part of the price, and only brought a part to lay at the apostles' feet, stating at the same time that they had given the whole amount. But Peter said:

“Ananias, why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghost, and to keep back part of the price of the land? While it remained, was it not thine own? and after it was sold, was it not in thine own power?” He was

under no obligation to sell the land for benevolent purposes until he promised so to do; then he was. (Eccles. v. 4, 5.) Or, without making any such promise, he was at liberty to sell it, and retain all the money it brought; but if he told the apostles that he sold the land for the benefit of the Church, which was to have the entire proceeds, then to withhold a part of the price, and to say that he had given the whole, was hypocrisy, deception, and sacrilege.

Thus, instead of supporting the communists in their ultra fanatical views, this pentecostal transaction utterly refutes them.

Chapter II.
Christian Almsgiving.

511
The second part of the article, which is in keeping with the first, and with the whole tenor of Scripture, is a complete refutation of communism.

§ 1. Scripture Teachings.

The Scriptures exhort to industry and frugality, in order to liberality. According to Wesley's gnome: Make all you can, honestly; save all you can, frugally; give all you can, liberally.

There would be small inducement for men to be industrious and frugal if the indolent and prodigal were to share the property which the industrious and frugal make and save. Christianity is not so self-contradictory, so suicidal as that. Hear the apostle: "Let him that stole steal no more: but rather let him labor, working with his hands the thing which is good, that he may have to give to him that needeth." (Eph. iv. 28.) "Work with your own hands . . . that ye may walk honestly toward them that are without, and that ye may have lack of nothing." (1 Thess. iv. 11, 12.) "For even when we were with you, this we commanded you, that if any would not work, neither should he eat. For we hear that there are some which walk among you disorderly, working not at all, but are busybodies. Now them that are such, we command and exhort by our Lord Jesus Christ, that with quietness they work, and eat their own bread." (2 Thess. iii. 10–12.)

The early Christians had a community of poor widows who were supported by the charity of the Church. Some mean persons, who were able to support their widowed mothers and grandmothers, devolved the burden upon the Church. This, as it well might, excited the indignation of the apostle, and he affirmed that such niggardly wretches denied the faith and were worse than the heathen, who considered it a filial duty to take care of their helpless parents and other kindred. He insisted that the members of the Church who had widowed relatives should relieve them, and let

not the Church be charged, so that it might be able to "relieve them that were widows indeed"—that is, who had no children or other relatives to take care of them. (1 Tim. v. 3–16.)

512

The Scriptures abound with injunctions to liberality, hospitality, and kindness to the poor, which would be altogether impertinent on the principle of communism. We will refer to a few of the passages which relate to this subject: Deut. xv. 1–18; xvi. 10; Ps. xli. 1; cxii. 9; Prov. xi. 24, 25; xxii. 9; xxviii. 27; Eccles. xi. 1–6; Isa. lviii. 7–10; Matt. vi. 1–4; xxv. 31–46; Luke iii. 11; xiv. 12–14; xxi. 1–4; Acts xx. 33–35; Rom. xii. 13; xv. 25–28; 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2; 2 Cor. viii.–x.; Gal. vi. 6–10; Phil. iv. 10–18; 1 Tim. vi.; Heb. xiii. 16; James ii. 14–16; 1 John iii. 17; 3 John 5–8. Those who were distinguished for their liberality are highly commended; as Jesus Christ, 2 Cor. viii. 9; Zaccheus, Luke xix. 8; Cornelius, Acts x. 2; the widow, Mark xii. 42–44; Dorcas, Acts ix. 36; the Churches of Macedonia, 2 Cor. viii. 1–5.

§ 2. General Principles of Christian Conduct.

The Scriptures nowhere lay down any definite rules as to the amount of time, labor, and care, which we are to expend in the accumulation of property, or of frugality and economy in husbanding our means; or in what proportion we are to dispense them in the exercise of our liberality. We are free moral agents, and the dispensation under which we live deals very little in precise rules of conduct.

We must not injure our health, or our neighbor in his reputation, property, or person, or "rob God" of the time and strength necessary for the higher duties of religion, in order to acquire riches. We must let our conversation be without covetousness, and we must be moderate in our desires for the accumulation of property.

We must not be niggardly and ascetic in our habits, close and hard in our dealings with others, in order to save money, under the guise of frugality. We must be liberal to ourselves as well as to others.

We must not inconsiderately squander our means upon all who come in our way, whether they deserve it or not; nor imprudently

decrease our capital, so that we shall not have the means of accumulating more. This is a kind of liberality which borders on prodigality. “A good man showeth favor and lendeth: he will guide his affairs with discretion.” (Ps. cxii. 5.)

In none of these points is there any danger of our going astray if we have a renewed nature, an enlightened, rectified conscience,

a sanctified will, the spirit of consecration, and humble dependence on the providence and grace of God for direction.

§ 3. No Christian Tithe Law.

Some people wish there was something like a tithe law to regulate our contributions to objects of piety and charity; some go so far as to say that there is. But there is none, and none is needed; it would be an impertinence under our dispensation. Indeed, the tithe system under the Jewish dispensation was merely designed to secure a certain support for the theocratical institutions of the Jewish economy. Personal and occasional benefactions were left then, as now, to the “discretion” of every one.

When Abram gave tithes to Melchizedek, it was only of the spoils which he had gained in “the slaughter of the kings,” as a thank-offering to the most high God, of whom Melchizedek was priest. (Gen. xiv.; Heb. vii.)

When Jacob vowed to give the tenth to the Lord of all that He might give him while in Padan-Aram, in case he should be brought back to his own country in peace (Gen. xxviii. 21, 22), he was complying with no law, and establishing no precedent. We never hear that he on any other occasion, or any of the patriarchs at any time, made such vows or presented such offerings.

A tenth might be too much for some, far too little for others, and entirely too *commercial* for any. The rule given to the Galatians and Corinthians, to lay up in store (not a tenth, but as God had prospered them) on the first day of the week, was for a specific purpose, a contribution for the poor saints in Jerusalem, for whom Paul was making collections. He wanted them to have it ready by the time he should give them a call, that he might “send their liberality (or gift) unto Jerusalem.” (1 Cor. xvi. 1–4.) Paul never dreamed of tithes. Doddridge hits the point:

To thee, as to our covenant, God,
We'll our whole selves resign;
And count that not one-tenth alone,
But all we have, is thine.

All belongs to God, and we ourselves are his. As David said, with a most princely display of liberality: "But who am I, and what is my people, that we should be able to offer so willingly after this sort? for all things come of thee, and of thine own have we given thee." (1 Chron. xxix. 14.)

Part III.

Article XXV.
Of a Christian Man's Oath.

514

As we confess that vain and rash swearing is forbidden Christian men by our Lord Jesus Christ and James his apostle, so we judge that the Christian religion doth not prohibit but that a man may swear when the magistrate requireth, in a cause of faith and charity, so it be done according to the prophet's teaching, in justice, judgment, and truth.

Introduction.

This is identical with the Thirty-ninth Article of the Anglican Confession, except that the word "the" is inserted before "Christian religion."

Chapter I.
Definition and History.

§ 1. Definition.

515

There are two words for oath in Hebrew—*alah* and *shebuah*—the former comprising an imprecation of woe upon the swearer if what he utters is false. This is implied in every solemn oath. The LXX. renders both words by ὅρχος, and the Vulgate by *juramentum*, or *jusjurandum*. Cicero defines an oath, an affirmation vouched for by an appeal to a divinity. To these two elements—(1) an affirmation, (2) an appeal to God—is added (3) a judicial occasion, when it is what is called a solemn oath, such as that noted in the article. Our authorities define an oath thus: "A solemn affirmation or declaration, made with an appeal to God for the truth of what is affirmed." It recognizes the omniscience, justice, power, and providence of God. Its solemnity is so great that among all people it has been considered of the last importance for the ascertainment of truth and the securement of fidelity. It is difficult to see how the affairs of the world could be carried on without it. Hence perjurers are stigmatized as the most detestable and dangerous characters in society, and are held obnoxious to most severe penalties. But this article has no more than an incidental bearing upon the taking of false oaths or disregarding the obligation of oaths that have been taken.

§ 2. Historical.

The article is supposed to have been leveled, like the preceding, against the Anabaptists. This is likely; but then it goes beyond them.

The Quakers and some others in our day think it unlawful to swear before a magistrate. This, indeed, seems strange, unaccountably strange, when such names as Forster, Gurney, Barclay, and Penn, are found in their list of worthies. But then the Waldenses, that "most ancient stock of religion," as Milton calls

them, abstained from all oaths. Among the errors laid to the charge of the Pelagians, and for which they were censured

by Augustin, was their opinion of the unlawfulness of oaths of every kind.

Indeed, some of the orthodox Fathers expressed themselves unguardedly on this subject. Chrysostom, in his Homilies to the people of Antioch, declaims more against swearing than perhaps any other man. "He and some others," as Bingham says, "in their sharp invectives against common swearing, seem sometimes to deny the lawfulness of all oaths to Christians in any case whatever."

So Tertullian says: "I say nothing of perjury, since it is unlawful even to swear." Yet he elsewhere says that Christians, though they did not swear by the emperor's genius—which was nothing but a devil—yet they did swear by the emperor's safety, which Bingham explains to be not swearing by the creature, but only naming it with relation to God by whom they swore—as Joseph, Gen. xlii. 15. Perhaps such a custom is more honored in the breach than in the observance.

But oaths before magistrates, councils, etc., were not only allowed by the Fathers, but were also required by them, and were as common among them as among us. (See Bingham, *Antiquities* xvi. 7.)

Chapter II. The Lawfulness of Oaths.

517

How any one who respects the teachings of revelation can fail to see the lawfulness of solemn oaths, and, indeed, their importance and obligation, we cannot imagine.

§ 1. Scripture Teachings.

The article alludes to Jer. iv. 2: “And thou shalt swear, The Lord liveth, in truth, in judgment, and in righteousness;” and the prophet adds, “and the nations shall bless themselves in him, and in him shall they glory.” This shows that solemn swearing is an act of homage to the Divine Sovereign, an expression of the highest reverence and devotion. He may have had his eye on Deut. x. 20: “Thou halt fear the Lord thy God; him shalt thou serve, and to him shalt thou cleave, and swear by his name.” And why not? God himself is represented as swearing: “By myself have I sworn, saith the Lord.” (Gen. xxii. 16.) To this the apostle refers in Heb. vi. 13–18: “For when God made promise to Abraham, because he could swear by no greater, he sware by himself, saying, Surely, blessing I will bless thee, and multiplying, I will multiply thee. And so, after he had patiently endured, he obtained the promise.” And expatiating on it, the apostle refers to the common sentiments of mankind: “For men verily swear by the greater: and an oath for confirmation is to them an end of all strife. Wherein God, willing more abundantly to show unto the heirs of promise the immutability of his counsel, confirmed it by an oath: that by two immutable things, in which it was impossible for God to lie, we might have a strong consolation, who have fled for refuge to lay hold upon the hope set before us.”

Christ bore testimony under oath, and thereby proved its lawfulness and great importance. He recognized the right of the high-priest, in his official capacity, to adjure him by the living God to testify as to his claims. This is the most solemn form of an oath. (Matt. xxvi. 63, 64.) Thus Jehovah himself swears:

518

"As truly as I live, all the earth shall be filled with the glory of the Lord." (Num. xiv. 21.)

In Rev. x. 5, 6, John says: "And the angel which I saw stand upon the sea and upon the earth lifted up his hand to heaven, and sware by him that liveth forever and ever, who created heaven, and the things that therein are, and the earth and things that therein are, and the sea, and the things which are therein, that there should be time no longer." The amplification of the predicates of God, whose name for the greater effect is suppressed, gives great weight and solemnity to the angel's oath.

The Bible abounds with instances of swearing, or solemn affirmation, by patriarchs, prophets, apostles, and others. The earliest instance recorded is in Gen. xxi. 22–31; *cf.* xxvi. 26–33; xxiv. 3, 8, 9; xxxi. 44, 53; l. 25; Ex. xxii. 11; Num. v. 19; xxx. 2; Josh, ii. 12; 1 Sam. xx. 16, 17; 1 Kings viii. 31; 2 Kings xi. 4; 2 Chron. xv. 14, 15; Neh. x. 29; Ps. xv. 4; cxix. 106; cxxxii. 1, 2; Eccles. viii. 2; Dan. xii. 7, and other places.

The waitings of Paul abound with solemn obtestations, if not properly oaths—*e. g.*, Rom. ix. 1; 1 Cor. xv. 31; 2 Cor. i. 18, 23; xi. 10, 31; xii. 19; Gal. i. 20; Phil. i. 8; 1 Thess. ii. 5; v. 27.

§ 2. Our Saviour's Command.

In view of the foregoing, it cannot be reasonably supposed that "our Lord Jesus Christ and James his apostle" forbade the taking of solemn oaths.

Christ says, "Swear not at all; but let your communication be, Yea, yea; Nay, nay; for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil." The entire passage shows that our Lord had no reference to solemn or judicial swearing, which was only by the name of God. He interdicted all swearing by any but God; and the interdict includes all substitution of the name of God in an oath by something resembling it.

The Jews were very loose in their casuistry concerning oaths, like the Jesuits of our times. They interpreted the language, "Thou shall not forswear thyself, but shall perform unto the Lord thine oaths" (found substantially in Ex. xx. 7; Lev. xix. 12; Num. xxx. 2; Deut. xxiii. 23), as if only those oaths were binding which were sworn by God. The third commandment, "Thou shalt not take the

name of the Lord thy God in vain, for the Lord will not hold him guiltless which taketh his name in vain,"

519

is perhaps a prohibition of perjury, "vanity" in the Hebrew frequently meaning falsehood. To take, or to lift up, the name of God means to swear by his name, and the word rendered "in vain" probably means "for a falsehood." It does not seem to mean "vain" as the word is used in our article, though the Septuagint renders, as we do, ἐπὶ *ματαίῳ*, in vain, or for a trivial purpose. The interlarding of common conversation with oaths of any kind is what Christ and James forbid.

A rash oath is one that is inconsiderately taken, whether in or out of a court of justice. A vain oath is one that is taken on trivial grounds. Both are alike profane; both are alike prohibited. They are altogether different from those solemn oaths taken by patriarchs, prophets, apostles, angels, Christ, and God, as already noticed; very different from the oaths required by magistrates in a cause of faith and charity: these are solemn appeals to God for the confirmation of the truth and the defense of innocence.

THE END.